THE DANGEROUS MANEUVERS OF N. KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP ON THE SO-CALLED FIGHT AGAINST THE "CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL„ SHOULD BE STRIPPED BARE OF THEIR MASK

TIRANA, 1964

THE DANGEROUS MANEUVERS OF N. KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP ON THE SO-CALLED FIGHT AGAINST THE "CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL,, SHOULD BE STRIPPED BARE OF THEIR MASK

(Reproduced from the 1964 June 12,13 & 14 issues of the «ZERI I POPULLIT» daily).

THE «NAIM FRASHËRI» STATE PUBLISHING HOUSE
TIRANA, 1964

N. Khrushchev's group and those who follow them return again and again, persistently and with fuming rage to their unbridled attacks on J V Stalin and to their so-called fight against the «cult of the individual». Attacks of this kind have recently been launched in M. Suslov's February 1964 report to the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in N. Khrushchev's speeches during his recent visit to Hungary, in the revisionist press of the leadership of the French Communist Party as well as in other writings of the modern revisionists.

Attacks in these documents are made in two main directions:

On one hand, these documents repeat and «supplement» with «fresh facts» the monstruous accusations and slanders against Stalin borrowed from the most reactionary and Trotzkyite propaganda. As a matter of fact Stalin is likened to such tyrants as Ivan the Terrible, Napoleon, Kerensky, Petain and others, the whole period of his leadership is characterized as a period of «massive reprisals», where «methods of violence and oppression» reigned, an «inhumane regime»,

a period during which people in the Soviet Union «starved to death» and so on, and Soviet society is represented through historical parallels and various maneuvers as the offspring of the oppressive, anti-popular and bloody regimes of Ivan the Terrible, Boris Godunov, the Russian Tsars and of Kerensky

On the other hand, they attack in a slanderous way the marxist-leninist parties like the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania pretending that they practice in their country «the cult of the inlividual» and its «criminal methods» — terror, suppression of democracy, persecution and elimination of anti-dogmatist communists» and so on. Attempts are even made «to reason theoretically» that by standing in the positions of the «cult of the individual» and because of extreme petty bourgeois influences, these parties have allegedly departed from marxism-leninism and have slipped into «dogmatist», «sectarian», «adventuresome», «warmongering» «nationalist», «chauvinist», «racial», positions and so on and so forth.

These reproaches are so common-place and so absurd as to pity the loss of time to answer them. And it is far from our purpose to start a debate on such absurdities. In this article we take upon ourselves the task of bringing to light what really lies behind this ear-splitting noise which N. Khrushchev's group and those who follow in their revisionist tracks have again raised regarding this so-called matter of «fighting the cult of the individual.»

N. KHRUSHCHEV'S FIGHT AGAINST «THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL» IS A MEANS TO CONCEAL AND JUSTIFY HIS ANTI-MARXIST AND TRAITOROUS LINE OF ACTION.

The marxist-leninists have always been and are bitterly opposed on principle to the cult of the individual in whatever form it might manifest itself, because the cult of the individual is contrary in principle to the basic thesis of the marxist doctrine on the decisive role of the popular masses in history, because it causes great practical damage to the revolutionary movement of the working class and to the building of socialism and communism. In one of his letters Marx wrote that he and Engels enrolled for the first time in a clandestine society of communists «...with the proviso that everything that helped mystic subjugation to authority should be wiped out of the constitution». (Karl Marx & Fredrich Engels: Works, Russian edition 1935, vol. XXVI, p. 488). A bitter war against all manifestations of the cult of the individual has been waged by V. I. Lenin. J .V. Stalin has likewise firmly expressed himself more than once against idolizing specific individuals against the conceitedness of leaders and their alienation from the masses. «Lenin teaches us» J. Stalin said, «that only those are true bolsheviki leaders who do not only teach the workers and peasants but are also taught by them» (Stalin, Questions of Leninism, Russian edition 1939, p. 505). Whereas in a letter to Shatunovsky Stalin wrote: «You speak

of your «loyalty» towards me.... I would advise you to do away with the principle of loyalty towards separate individuals. This is not Bolsheviki-like. Be loyal to the working class, to its party, to its state. This is a necessary and a good thing. But do not confound this with loyalty towards specific individuals, which is an empty and unnecessary prattle of a sick intellectual.» (J. V. Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 13, page 19).

The Party of Labor of Albania has always loyally abided and continues to abide by the teachings of marxism-leninism on the indispensability of fighting the cult of the individual. But at the same time the Party of Labor of Albania has abided by the important leninist teachings on the role of the leaders of the working class who enjoy authority and respect among the masses, who are closely bound to them, who embody their ideas, wisdom and aspirations, who defend their interests with fidelity and who are capable of leading them in overthrowing capitalism and building socialism and communism. Therefore, while firmly opposing any manifestation of the cult of the individual, our party opposes at the same time any attempt to ignore the role of the revolutionary leaders of the working class, and least of all, to discredit or eliminate them. This is a matter of principle.

J. V. Stalin was a great revolutionary leader of distinguished historical merits for the Soviet people and the international working class, that is why he enjoyed such high authority. And if in his role as a leader he has mani-

fested, as the revisionists claim, a cult of the individual, greatly to blame for this are also such persons as N. Khrushchev and A. Mikoyan, who seem to have been aware of this and yet far from criticizing him, have sung praises to Stalin, calling him «the father, the wise teacher, the ingenious leader of the Soviet Party and people and of the workers of the entire world» (Khrushchev), «the genius of socialism», «the engenious architect of communist society», «the great heir and promoter of Lenin's work», «Lenin of today», in whose work «marxist-leninist philosophy» which transforms the world, has reached its acme (Mikoyan), «Coryphaeus of science», «the genius of mankind» (Suslov) and so on and so forth. This is what Khrushchev and Co said when Stalin was alive, and this goes to prove that they were hypocrits and traitors in disguise.

N. Khrushchev's unprincipled stand towards Stalin is clearly borne out also in many of his contradictory statements following the death of Stalin, even after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, where, as every one knows, he «excommunicated» J. Stalin criticizing him in a slanderous way for grave mistakes and ugly crimes.

On April 6 this year speaking at a rally in Mishkolz, Hungary, N, Khrushchev launched a bitter attack in a cynical way on those «who want to revive Stalin's corps, on those who want to rely not on the ideas of marxism-leninism, not on the good faith and friendship among peoples, but on the hatchet and the knife». He said: «According to a popular tradition the dead

are borne away from the house with their feet to the fore so that they may never come back again. We removed Stalin away from our home and no one will bring him back again. Let those who so desire take him into their own houses, if they like the stink of corpses». Whereas in a speech at the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Moscow on January 17, 1957 N. Khrushchev said: «Stalin's name is inseparable from marxism-leninism. Therefore each of us members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, wants to be loyal to the cause of marxism-leninism, to the cause of fighting for the interests of the working class, just as Stalin has stood loyal to this cause.» In a speech at a reception in the Embassy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in Moscow on February 18, 1957, Khrushchev likewise said: «Stalin has served the interests of the working class, the cause of marxism-leninism, loyally and we shall not turn Stalin over to the enemy».

Is it thus not clear enough that by launching bitter attacks on Stalin, whose name is inseparable from marxism-leninism, N. Khrushchev's group of renegates try to «move away from their house» marxism-leninism itself, while fraternal parties who uphold in principle Stalin's ideas and work, are this way defending marxism-leninism from the Khrushchevian revisionists?

Just how genuine and of «principle» is the so-called fight against «the cult of the individual» which N. Khrushchev's group wage, is clearly borne out also by the fact that the Soviet

leaders are using all methods and means to foster and promote the cult of Nikita Khrushchev who has been proclaimed as «the expert», the «father» and «pioneer» of all branches ranging from the cultivation of maize, the raising of swine, fertilizers of various kinds and mines, to literature and art, military strategy, rockets and space flights! In revisionist propaganda Khrushchev is becoming more and more «the hero» and «most outstanding personality» of the civil war, the «true strategist» of the decisive battles and fronts of the Great Patriotic War, the person who embodies and holds the fate of peace of the world in his hands and so on and so forth. Formerly, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, N. Khrushchev had criticized in a «genuine way of principle» J. Stalin because he held the keypositions both in the Party and in the State, calling this as one of the clearest expression of the cult of the individual. Whereas later on he tried his utmost to concentrate into his own hands his position of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR in addition to that of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

A contradictory situation is thus created which bespeaks the utterly unprincipled line of N Khrushchev: on one hand he calls Stalin a distinguished revolutionary marxist-leninist, whereas on the other he hurls dirty mud on him; on one hand he loudly disapproves Stalin's «cult of the individual» while, on the other,

he nurtures the cult of his own person in an unrestricted way; on one hand he says that Stalin made nothing but mistakes and hampered progress (the historical achievements of the Soviet people during that period seem to have been attained, therefore, without leadership, in a spontaneous way and even contrary to the acts of the leadership) while, on the other, a big noise is raised that now no important steps are taken nor can be taken without N. Khrushchev's personal «initiative», «concern» and without his «direct participation», «instructions» and «directives»; on one hand N. Khrushchev preaches «broad development of democracy», «collective leadership», «the living initiative» of each, «decentralization», while, on the other, he concentrates all state and party power in the hands of one single individual, himself, monopolizing all management pushing all others aside and what not.

It turns out from all this that the ear-splitting noise of N. Khrushchev and his group regarding the so-called «fight against the cult of the individual» is nothing but a farce, a demagogical maneuver. In fact, N. Khrushchev is not all worried about upholding the well-known principle of the founders of marxism-leninism on the indispensability of opposing all manifestations of the cult of the individual. There is no question whatsoever of the alleged existence of «Stalin's cult of the individual» which is claimed to have been a sore spot of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the socialist countries and of the entire internation-

al communist movement. The truth is that by raising such a hue and cry about the «cult of the individual» N. Khrushchev's group have pursued and continue to pursue certain other objectives on which we shall dwell at length in this article.

The fact that N. Khrushchev's group turns again and again with such persistency to the question of Stalin, even when more than 11 years have elapsed since his death, goes to prove that people are not at all persuaded by N. Khrushchev's stale prattle against J. Stalin, that they are becoming more and more convinced that «the new course» spread by N. Khrushchev and his group under the label of «anti-Stalinism» is revisionist from top to bottom which has led the Soviet country and party into a blind alley, which has greatly damaged the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, it goes to prove that «the Stalin question» has remained for N. Khrushchev's group, an unsolved and very preoccupying problem, an incurable sore spot, a bone that has stuck in the throat and is stiffling them.

The Khrushchevian revisionists have stood and stand in need of the hue and cry about the «cult of the individual»:

Firstly, to serve as a smoke screen behind which to hide, to justify and to spread throughout the international communist movement, their anti-marxist, opportunist and treacherous line — their line of the so-called «peaceful coexistence», «peaceful competition», «peace-

ful transition» and «humane, democratic and liberal socialism», borrowed from the old and new opportunists of the Bernstein and Kautzky type, of the right-wing socialists and renegate Tito, elaborated and «perfected» by N. Khrushchev's group. This is in fact the line of capitulation to the imperialists and union with them, the line of checking and stifling the revolutionary and liberation movement of peoples, the line of bourgeois, liberal degeneration of socialism.

Secondly, in order to appease the marxist-leninist parties which uphold J. V. Stalin's revolutionary ideas and work and oppose the treacherous acts of N. Khrushchev and his followers, in order to discredit these parties and remove in this way the obstacles that lie in his revisionist way, N. Khrushchev holds forth the question of the «cult of the individual» as a scarecrow in order to exert pressure on other parties, in order to interfere in their internal affairs and do away with leaders who are not to his liking.

Facts go to show that the slogan of fighting the «cult of the individual» has always served the modern revisionists, with N. Khrushchev's group at the head, to attain their counter-revolutionary objectives: under the slogan of «doing away with the consequences of the period of the cult of the individual» they rehabilitated Tito's treacherous clique and other renegates; under the demagogical slogan of «fighting against the cult of the individual» they brought about the 1956 crisis in Poland,

they carried out the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary and organized the anti-party plot at the Tirana regional conference of the Party; under the pretext of «fighting against the cult of the individual and its consequences» they eliminated the sound revolutionary leaders in the Soviet Union and in other countries; under the mask of «criticizing the cult of the individual and its consequences,» they discredited the Soviet socialist order and furnished weapons to imperialist reaction and right-wing social-democrat leaders to fight more effectively against the ideas of scientific socialism and to sow confusion and discord in the workers and various democratic and progressive movements; the accusation for «the cult of the individual» and for «barbarous methods of the cult of the individual» was one of the principal «arguments» which N. Khrushchev used from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress to publicly discredit and condemn the Party of Labor of Albania for having refused to kneel obeissance and for opposing his treacherous revisionist line and to thus deepen the rift in the ranks of the international communist movement and so on and so forth. There is no doubt that the present attacks against the so-called «cult of the individual» serve N. Khrushchev's renegate group too in furthering their great counter-revolutionary plot against the international communist movement and the socialist camp.

Speaking at Pula in November 1956 during the days of the counter-revolutionary events in Hungary and only a few months after the 20th

Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where N. Khrushchev read his ill-famed «secret» report «On Stalin's cult of the individual and its consequences», renegate Tito had said that it was not only a question of the cult of the individual alone, but of the order of things that made its manifestation possible, that therefore it was essential to radically change the social and state order itself in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries. Thus, in his attempt to encourage him to proceed further towards undermining socialism, Tito exposed N. Khrushchev, laid bare his true aims, to wit: his use of the so-called «fight against the cult of the individual and its consequences» in order to discredit the Soviet socialist order, in order to justify the line of bourgeois degeneration of the socialist order which N. Khrushchev's traitorous group pursue with persistence.

At that time, in order to cover up the tracks behind him, N. Khrushchev and his propaganda agents formally opposed Tito. But subsequent events proved beyond contestation that N. Khrushchev's group's fight against «Stalin's cult of the individual» was really directed against the Soviet socialist order, aimed at justifying «the radical change», in other words, at degenerating this order. Thus, in the 14 July 1963 open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union we read that whoever upholds Stalin and his deeds, he upholds «**that order, that ideology and ethics, those forms and methods of management** which thrived during the period

of the cult of the individual» (underlining by the editors). Likewise, «La Nouvelle Critique», published by the French Communist Party, dedicates almost its whole December 1963 issue to the question of «Stalin's cult of the individual» and cites as a reason for the rise of the cult of the individual among others such essential aspects of the social order of socialism as the existence of the socialist state which it is claimed leads inevitably to bureaucracy, to the leadership of one single party, to the centralized management of the entire social life and so on.

Tito's long time and Khrushchev's present attacks as well as those of his revisionist followers, are directed also against the basis of Stalin's foreign policy, against his whole line in relations among communist and workers parties and among socialist countries and so on.

It is, therefore, a question of revising all the revolutionary marxist-leninist views and acts of Stalin. It is therefore the duty of the marxist-leninist parties, of all true communists, for whom the cause of the working class and of socialism is dear, to mercilessly expose the dangerous maneuvers of N. Khrushchev's group regarding the so-called «fight against the cult of the individual» and to lay bare their true aims, to give the lie to their slanderous reproaches against J. Stalin and against the marxist-leninist parties, to stand firmly for Stalin's revolutionary views and acts as a matter of principle.

THE AIM OF THE REVISIONISTS IS TO DO AWAY WITH THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

One of the main objectives of the modern revisionists in their attempts to degenerate and undermine the socialist order, is to discredit and do away with the dictatorship of the proletariat. By launching most monstruous slanders against Stalin and by calling the period of his leadership as a «period in which terror, crimes, injustices, persecutions, concentration camps and so on, reigned supreme», the revisionists assail in fact the dictatorship of the proletariat, try to describe it as a regime of terror, as a denial of democracy, as an order which must be done away with as soon as possible.

In this matter the modern revisionists with N. Khrushchev at the head, proceed along the path of all opportunists and renegates of the working class, who have always directed their heaviest blows against the dictatorship of the proletariat, along the path which draws the line between the marxists and the foes of marxism-leninism. To slander against the dictatorship of the proletariat and to proceed along the path of doing away with it means to openly betray the cause of socialism and of communism.

As a true student and promoter of Lenin's work, J.V. Stalin has been an indomitable fighter in safeguarding and consolidating the socialist order against foes of every kind, in strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and maintaining it at its proper height. He maintained

the view that «the cause of the dictatorship of the proletariat is, above all, the sum and substance of the proletarian revolution», that «the proletarian revolution, its motto, its leap forward, its achievements become reality only through the dictatorship of the proletariat», that «the dictatorship of the proletariat is the weapon of the proletarian revolution, its organ, its main support, set up firstly to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiters and to consolidate the achievements attained, and, secondly, to carry the proletarian revolution to its logical conclusion, to carry the revolution to the complete triumph of socialism» (see: Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 6, pp 111 & 112). The historical experience of all proletarian revolutions has proven that any weakening of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat under whatever pretext, that of «liberalism» or «democratism», has been associated with very dangerous consequences for the revolution and socialism. The examples of Titoite Jugoslavia and the 1956 counter-revolutionary events in Hungary are very typical in this direction.

To Stalin belongs the great merit of having successfully withstood all the intrigues and plots of the foreign and infernal enemies of the Soviet Union and of having frustrated all their plans to restore capitalism. It was only by courageously smashing the enemies of all hues that the historic achievements of the revolution and socialism could be safeguarded, that the fascist hordes could be made short work of during the Great Patriotic War and that bril-

liant successes could be achieved in building socialism and communism.

Khrushchev's accusations regarding Stalin's crimes arouse lawful suspicion; they are false; the so-called «fresh facts» which N. Khrushchev cites are hatched up and distorted. Within the framework of an extended war against many foes who were the remnants of the exploiting classes, of the various anti-marxist groups shattered by the party, or agents of the imperialists smuggled in large numbers into the Soviet Union encircled on all sides by the furious waves of the capitalist sea, in the framework of this bitter and most complicated war, there may of course have been made some mistakes on the part of the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat against individual persons. But only the sworn enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the socialist order can draw from this the conclusion that the period of Stalin's leadership has allegedly been characterized by terror, denial of democracy, persecutions, jails and concentration camps, insecurity for life and others like these.

But why should Stalin alone be reproached for these «crimes», if they should have really happened, when it is known that all the leaders of that time, including Khrushchev himself, have fully backed him up in his fight against the enemies of the Party and of socialism? Khrushchev at that time even showed great zeal. Speaking at the regional conference of the Party in Moscow on June 6, 1937 he said: «Our Party will mercilessly smash the band of traitors,

will wipe out from the face of the world the whole right-wing Trotzkyite corpse... A warranty for this is the unwavering leadership of our Central Committee, the unwavering leadership of our leader Comrade Stalin. We will make short work of our enemies from the first to the last and will scatter their ashes in the air». On June 8, 1938 Khrushchev said also at the 4th regional conference at Kiev: «The jakirs, balickis, ljubchenks, zatonsks and other rascals like them, intended to bring the Polish pans into the Ukrain, they intended to bring here the German fascists, the landowners and capitalists... We have made short work of many enemies but not yet of all. Therefore we should be on the alert.»

This is what N. Khrushchev used to say in the past. Whereas now he acts quite differently: he burnt Stalin's remains and spread his ashes in the air, while he rehabilitated and raised the pedestal of «martyrdom» and of «heroes» and decided to even raise a memorial in Moscow to the «band of traitors», to the «Trotzkyite corpse», to those who intended «to bring into the Soviet Union the landlords and capitalists, the German fascists and Polish pans.

Just who are «the victims» whom N. Khrushchev takes under his protection, we Albanians know too well from our own experience. He rehabilitated and took under his protection renegate Tito and his companions, who have carried on and keep carrying on an incessant hostile activity against our party and our country, and who were among the principal authors of the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary (a thing

which turns out in all clarity from the correspondence between Khrushchev and Tito at that time). Khrushchev had taken traitor Imre Nagy and his accomplices under his protection. He had insisted on rehabilitating Koçi Xoxe and has taken under his protection the enemies of our party and of our country, the agents of the imperialists and of the Titoite clique, like Liri Gega and Panajot Plaku and C0. It was N. Khrushchev in person who spread the slogan that the plot organized against the People's Republic of Albania by the Jugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarchist fascists and the American imperialists, in collaboration with certain Albanian traitors inside and outside Albania, in 1961, was trumped up, that its participants who appeared before the court of people's justice, were «patriots and honest fighters», and who took them openly under his protection at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union accusing as agents of imperialism and sold to them for thirty silver coins, not these traitors but the leaders of our Party and of our State.

By taking into his protection renegates and traitors, by proclaiming them as «martyrs» and «Stalin's victims» N. Khruschev shows in truth his own features of a renegate and traitor, that is why he tries to maneuver and disguise himself. Thus, in his speech to writers and artists on March 8, 1963 Khrushchev said that he and other leading cadres were informed of the arrests made in Stalin's time but they did not know that innocent people were being ar-

rested. But if that is so, then why should we admit that Stalin too did not know that innocent people were being arrested and that some one else made all these arrests without the knowledge of Stalin and of the other leading cadres? But how can it be that N. Khrushchev former secretary of the party organization in Moscow, where, according to him, the weight of «arbitrarity» and of «violation of justice» was more deeply felt, should not know why people of his organization were being arrested and why should he not raise his voice against these «injustices»? How can a man so «wise», «ingenious», as Khrushchev has been now dubbed by the revisionist propaganda, should not observe all that «terror», all that atmosphere of «stifling democracy», of that «abuse of power», of «persecutions», of «insecurity» that seem to have reigned in the party and in the country? Where has this «leader» «flown» all this time, who propagates today that he has always lived with the masses, has always been closely bound to them and has been well aware of the life and concern of men?

It turns clearly out that all the noise Khrushchev and his group make about the so-called «crimes» of J. V. Stalin is a big bluff and an impudent calumny which aims at discrediting the socialist order and the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the other hand, if all what Khrushchev says were true, then it would be impossible for Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Suslov and others who have been in the leadership and reported matters to Stalin, not to know, and

therefore they are to render account of this and be sentenced as accomplices in the «crimes» committed and for the whole unwholesome situation created in the Communist Party and through the Soviet country.

We want to mention here one other fact. In the resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union taken in July 1953 regarding the Beria affair we read: «When Stalin was alive and with him participating» the December 4, 1952 decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was taken on «the situation in the Ministry of State Security» in which it was stressed that «an end should be put at once to the lack of control on the activity of the Organs of the Ministry of State Security and that their work at the center and in the regions should be placed under the continuous and systematic control of the party». Thus it turns out that even in the last days of his life, when, according to Khrushchev, his cult and arbitrarity had reached its acme, Stalin was a firm opponent of arbitrarity and demanded the establishment of the control of the party on the organs of security. And how can this be reconciled with Khrushchev's monstrous calumny against Stalin?

N. Khrushchev's hypocritical and traitorous features are clearly evident in still another matter. In the same July 1953 resolution of the plenum regarding the Beria affair it is written: «Beria's criminal plans to establish personal contacts with Tito and Rankovich in Jugoslavia

have recently been brought to light». At that time this constituted one of the gravest accusations for Beria. But now that N. Khrushchev has established not only «personal contacts» with Tito and Rankovich, but has joined in with and has become one with them, how shall we call it? If Beria's act is punishable so is Khrushchev's and even more so for Beria had only planned to get in contact with Tito and Rankovich whereas Khrushchev put these plans into execution.

Those who defend Stalin and his work, the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated July 14, 1963 has it, defend «the order» existing in Stalin's time. Whereas the «La Nouvelle Critique», the publication of the French Communist Party states it more clearly: «There is no doubt that the situation and structure of the USSR made the cult possible» (see page 61 in its 1963 December issue). It adds further: «Soviet Society is the offspring (unconscious!) of a society the state practices of which contain an old tradition of police arbitrariness and terror». Ivan the Terrible and «Peter the Great» together with «Boris Godunov» and other works are the cultural witnesses of this» (page 27). It is clear that **something must be changed** in this Soviet Society which is claimed to have inherited «police arbitrariness» and «methods of terror» from the former anti-popular regimes of the czars. In other words it is a question of changing the order and structure existing in the USSR during Stalin's time, that is, the order of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And in what directions are these changes to be made?

The revisionists demand «the liberalization» of the socialist order. The slogan of «liberalism» has become today the principal aspect of the endeavors of the foes of socialism to degenerate and liquidate the socialist order. As a matter of fact it was this very slogan under which the 1956 counter-revolutionary coup was waged in Hungary; for «liberalism» is the principal demand and condition which the imperialists lay before N. Khrushchev's group and their revisionist followers in certain other socialist countries, as a recompensation for the so-called «peaceful coexistence». Under the slogan of «liberalism» the revisionists and imperialists demand freedom of action for the foes of socialism, for the opponents of socialism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main obstacle to this. For the enemies of the class and of socialism under whatever guise they may appear, there is and there cannot be freedom or democracy under the dictatorship of the proletariat. As an unwavering marxist-leninist Stalin has always faithfully observed these teachings of importance of Lenin.

The revisionists with N. Khrushchev's group in the lead, are now showing clearly that their objective is the elimination of the dictatorship of the proletariat. «Every class state» the above issue of the «La Nouvelle Critique» writes, «contains in it the principle of its own faith, of its own cult» (page 5). But it is a fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is also a class

state. Therefore, according to revisionist logic, it turns out that the root of the cult of the individual in socialism lies in the existence of the socialist class state itself, that is, in the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, consequently, the danger of the cult of the individual can be eliminated only with the abolishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And lo! N. Khrushchev's group proclaimed at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that the USSR had «crossed over» from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the Soviet socialist «state of all the people». While the French revisionists, relying on these «new creative developments of marxism-leninism» replaced the marxist-leninist thesis of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the term «temporary» dictatorship of the proletariat (see «L'Humanité» dt March 23, 1964). In this article we read among others: «The founders of scientific socialism have always shown that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a transitory period, therefore, temporary by its very nature. Soviet experience shows how the dictatorship of the proletariat yields its place to the state of all the people. **For a country like France it can be, affirmed that this contemporary period may be shorter,** especially since the world bourgeoisie has been already dealt so heavy blows». (underlining by the editors). And why do the revisionist leaders of the French Communist Party stand so much in need of this? The above article goes on to say that since the socialists have expressed themselves for a **temporary dictatorship of**

the proletariat, this goes to show that «a renconciliation between the communists and socialists is also possible in certain ideological issues».

Thus, the theses of the modern revisionists on the «temporary dictatorship» of the proletariat and on the «state of all the people» is a big concession of principle which they make to the renegates and traitors of the working class — to the right wing social-democrat leaders, to the bourgeoisie and the imperialists themselves. It is not casual that all of these have gladly hailed the «liberalization» of the socialist order in the Soviet Union and in the other countries where the revisionists are in power.

And in fact the transformation of the Soviet state into a «state of all the people», which actually means the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a major betrayal to the cause of socialism.

First and foremost this is openly at variance with the teachings of the founders of marxism-leninism, who have forcefully stressed with the greatest clarity that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary «to the entire **historical period** separating capitalism from «classless society, from communism» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Albanian edition vol. 25, page 488). In the second program of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of the Soviet Union drawn up by Lenin, it is also written in very clear terms: «Contrary to bourgeois democracy, which keeps the class nature of the state under cover, the Soviet power openly admits the indispensability of the class nature

of the state, **until the division of society into classes is not done away with and every state power is not abolished.** (underlined by the editors). Obviously the thesis of the new, revisionist program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union maintaining that «the dictatorship of the working class ceases to be necessary before the state is annulled», that, consequently the Soviet state has lost its class nature and has been turned to «a state of the whole people», is an open departure from the teachings of marxism-leninism. It is evident that the revisionists attempt to distort and misrepresent the classics of marxism-leninism when they say that they allegedly considered the dictatorship of the proletariat necessary until the exploiting classes have been eliminated and socialism has been built, in other words, only for the first phase of communist society, whereas their statements on the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat up to the achievement of classless society — communism — seem to have slipped from their tongues and are inaccurate (!) This reminds one of the old revisionists, of Bernstein, Kautzky & C0, who pretended that the term «dictatorship of the proletariat» had just slipped from Marx's and Engels' pen and that it occupied no important place in their ideas, a pretension which Lenin has mercilessly given a lie to. Facts go to show that the modern revisionists with N. Khrushchev in the lead, worthy disciples of Bernstein and Kautzky, are proceeding along the same path of falsifying marxism.

Marxism-leninism teaches and day to day experience proves that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary until the complete triumph of communism for a number of important reasons:

Firstly, remnants of the overthrown exploiters class are still to be found in the socialist countries including the Soviet Union, for the elimination of exploiters as a class does not at all mean their physical elimination. Besides, there exist capitalist trends in the conscience of people which, under specific conditions, may give rise to various anti-socialist elements. So long as imperialism exists to nurture and incite hostile elements and anti-socialist trends in socialist countries, the class struggle in these countries is unavoidable and under these conditions the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to the edification of socialism and communism. Therefore, by ignoring the class struggle and by abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, N. Khrushchev's revisionist group gives free play to the enemy of the class, to the various anti-socialist elements and to the agents of imperialism to carry on their undermining activity.

Secondly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary until the final victory of socialism and communism is attained, until the danger of the restoration of capitalism is ultimately removed. N. Khrushchev's assurances that «the danger of restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union is out of question» have no basis whatever, they are sheer bluff. In reality the danger of the restoration of capitalism exists in every

socialist country, not excluding the Soviet Union, and this danger comes not only from eventual aggression by the imperialists but also from the revisionists who try to degenerate socialism. Not only the example of Titoite Jugoslavia but especially the fact that Khrushchev's revisionist group managed to seize the leadership in the Soviet Union and in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, show as clear as day that the danger of the restoration of capitalism through liberal-bourgeois degeneration of the socialist order is today a real one.

Thirdly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary until the time when communism is fully established, so long as class discrimination exists, so long as differences exist between the town and the countryside, between physical and mental work. Under these circumstances, in order to move society ahead towards communism it is necessary to have the leadership of the working class and, it is a fact that the working class exercises its role of leadership in socialist society primarily and mainly through the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and through the proletarian party. In order to discredit the dictatorship of the proletariat the modern revisionists distort its marxist-leninist meaning by limiting and reducing it to violence alone. Whereas Lenin and Stalin have more than once stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only violence, it is not even mainly violence but a special form of alliance of the working class with the peasantry and with the other groups of workers, under the leadership of the

working class, in the struggle for setting up the classless communist society. The dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin wrote in his «Great Initiative» means that «only one specific class, the urban workers and in general the workers in the factories and workshops, the industrial workers, can lead all the workers and the exploited in the struggle to overthrow the sway of capital, in the process of this overthrow itself, in the struggle to safeguard and consolidate their victory, in the work to set up the new social order, in the whole struggle to do completely away with classes» (Works, Russian edition, vol. 29, page 387). In the same writing Lenin points clearly out that the complete elimination of classes requires not only the elimination of private ownership of the means of production but also the levelling off of the differences between the city and the countryside, between people engaged in physical and mental work. (idem, page 388). By proclaiming the abolishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and transformation of the Soviet state into a «state of all the people», N. Khrushchev's group undermine in this way the role of the leadership of the working class without which no communist society can be built.

From all these it turns out very clearly that behind the so-called «fight against the cult of the individual» lie hidden the true designs of Khrushchev's renegate group to discredit and do away with the dictatorship of the proletariat and the whole socialist order of things.

THE REVISIONISTS TRY TO DEGENERATE AND TO LIQUIDATE THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS

Side by side with their attempts to discredit and to do away with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the modern revisionists with N. Khrushchev's group in the lead, are making use of their «fight against the cult of the individual» as a smoke screen behind which they hide their attempts to liquidate the revolutionary parties of the working class, to deprive them of the proletarian party spirit, to degenerate them into «bourgeois parties of the working class».

As a firm revolutionary marxist and loyal disciple of Lenin, J. V. Stalin has upheld and further developed the leninist teachings on the proletarian party of the new type, on the indispensability of its leadership both in the revolutionary struggle of the working class to overthrow capitalism and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat as well as in the struggle to safeguard and consolidate the socialist regime, to build socialism and communism.

He used to stress that the success of the proletarian revolution, the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be attained without the revolutionary party of the proletariat, divested of opportunism, irreconcilable with persons who make compromises and capitulate, revolutionary towards the bourgeoisie and their state power. He stressed likewise that such a party cannot be an ordinary social-democratic party, hopelessly plunged into

the mire of opportunism, dreaming only of «social reforms» within the framework of the capitalist order and afraid of the revolution. A party of this kind can only be a party of the new type, the marxist-leninist party, the party of social revolution capable of training the proletariat for a decisive skirmish with the bourgeoisie and to organize the success of the proletarian revolution. In order to achieve the triumph of the proletariat, J.V. Stalin says, it is essential to have «a new party, a combative party, a revolutionary party, bold enough to drive the proletariat into the war for power, experienced enough to command the complicated circumstances of the revolutionary situation and skilfull enough to sidetrack any obstacle lying in the way to its goal. Without a party of this kind there can be no question of overthrowing capitalism, of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. This new party is the party of leninism» (J.V. Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 6, page 174).

J.V. Stalin used to point out that the workers class stood in greater need of the revolutionary party after it had assumed power, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He firmly upheld great Lenin's teachings that «that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a bitter fight, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, pedagogical and administrative against the forces and traditions of the old society», that «without an iron party trained in war, without a party that commands the trust of all the honest elements of

the class in question, without a party capable of understanding the spiritual condition of the masses and influencing it, is impossible to wage this struggle with any chance of success». (V.I. Lenin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 31, page 33). Depending on Lenin's teachings, J. Stalin used to stress that the leadership of **one single party,** of the marxist-leninist party, is an essential condition to the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to the establishment of the new society—of socialism and communism. He used to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be exercised only through the party, as its driving force, that «the dictatorship of the proletariat can be complete only if it is led by one party, the communist party, which does not share nor should share the leadership with other parties» (J.V. Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 10, page 97).

To J.V. Stalin belong the great historic merit that after the death of Lenin and in irreconcilable combat with the various enemies of Lenin, safeguarded and consolidated the bolshevik unity of the party, gave a notable contribution towards developing and tempering Lenin's party in the bitter struggle to build socialism and communism and to defend the socialist homeland from imperialist aggression. Under the leadership of J.V. Stalin the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the glorious Bolshevik Party, became a brilliant example and source of inspiration for communists the world over.

By unscrupulously attacking J.V. Stalin and his work the modern revisionists directed their

blows first and foremost, against Lenin's thesis, firmly defended by J.V. Stalin, on the necessity of leading the revolutionary marxist-leninist party in the fight of the working class to overthrow capitalism and in the period of edification of socialism and communism. Thus, in the 1963 December issue of «La Nouvelle Critique» (page 14), «in accountig for» the rise of the «cult of the individual» in the Soviet Union we read among others: «The Soviet State had to assume a very centralized form.... This **centralized state apparatus itself was under the political management of a single party,** for the crossing over of the apparatus of the menshevik and revolutionary socialist parties to the side of armed intervention and, as a consequence, their interdiction since the early months of the revolution **made it impossible to exercise Soviet power in the form of a regime of many parties,** as it was in the first months of the revolution» (underlined by the editors). It is evident that the existence and leadership of a single party — of the Bolshevik Party — is considered by the revisionists as a **misfortune**, be it imposed by the historical circumstances of the time, which seems to have served as one of the reasons, main reason for the rise of «Stalin's cult of the individual» in the Soviet Union. The draftresolution for the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party (read: its revisionist leaders)... «has rejected the idea that the existence of one single party is an essential condition for transition to socialism. This idea upheld by Stalin constituted an abusive generalization of the specific circumstan-

ces under which the October revolution took place. Subsequent experience has gone to prove that the joint objectives of the parties representing the working classes in the cities and in the countryside lead to an ever deeper unity in crossing over to socialism, in building socialist society.

In our article of April 7, 1964, under the title «The modern revisionists in their way to social-democrat degeneration and fusion with social democracy» we have explained in detail that in order to hide their tracks, the modern revisionists purposely jumble up two different problems: the problem **of the indispensability of the leadership of one single party — of the marxist party** — in the socialist revolution and in the building of socialism, with the problem of the **existence of one or many parties** in the socialist order of things. Stalin did not at all deny the possibility of the existence of many parties in socialist countries, a thing which has been realized in various countries of the People's Democracy even in Stalin's time, whereas he explained the existence of one single party in the USSR under the concrete historical conditions in which the socialist revolution was effected in Russia (see, for instance, Stalin's conversation with the first American workers delegates, volume 10). But like a marxist-leninist of principle, Stalin stressed that the proletarian revolution could be successfully carried out and socialism could be built only under the leadership of one single party — of the revolutionary marxist-leninist party, for the marxist proleta-

rian party **does not share and should not share its leadership with other parties.**

Significant are the measures which the French revisionists propose in order to «avert» the rise in the future of the «cult of the individual» and the «violation of democracy» in France when it will embark on the road to socialism. Among them «La Nouvelle Critique» mentions: «.... to lay open the perspective of an alliance among democratic parties until the establishment of socialism and its edification, with the eventual use of the democratic forms inherited from the past, but capable of assuming a new popular substance (parliament, for instance). This means to take preliminary precautions and establish most effective guarantees against eventual attempts to abuse power or to bureaucratically deviate by these or other individuals» (page 51 & 52).

We have pointed out also in our former articles that a viewpoint of this kind ignoring the indispensability of the role of leadership by the revolutionary marxist party which has long been trumpeted abroad by the Titoite clique and by the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party with P. Togliati at the head, aims at degenerating and fusing in completely, ideologically and organizationally, the communist parties with «the bourgeois parties of the working class» like the present social-democratic parties, a thing which constitutes an arrant betrayal to the working class and to socialism. The connection which the revisionists now make between the thesis on the role of leadership of

the marxist party and the so-called «Stalin's cult of the individual» very clearly shows that the frenzied campaign of the revisionists against Stalin serves their anti-marxist designs to degenerate and do away with the revolutionary parties of the proletariat.

Khrushchev's «new creative discovery» on turning the party of the working class in the USSR into «a party of all the people», is likewise a link in the chain of the treacherous acts of the modern revisionists to do away with the proletarian marxist parties. This actually means denial of the role of leadership of the working class in the struggle for communisn and is altogether at variance with the teachings of marxism-leninism according to which «the necessity of the political party of the proletariat ceases only when classes cease completely to exist» (see: The Resolution on the role of the communist party in the proletarian revolution, adopted at the 2nd Congress of the Comintern, which held its proceedings under the direct presidency of Lenin). In fact, a party is an entirely class noton, therefore there can not be a party «above classes» or a «party of all the people». So long as there is a class struggle between socialism and capitalism, so long as class discrimination and discrimination between physical and mental work exist, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party as its nucleus of leadership, is essential to the successful edification of communist society. Only when the war between socialism and capitalism has wound up with the triumph of communism the

world over, when class discriminations and the discrimination between physical and mental work have been wiped out and when society has inscribed on its banner «from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs», then and only then can one speak of the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the proletarian party. But then society will no longer need any kind of state and any kind of party «of all the people». So long as these conditions remain unfulfilled, any attempt to do away with the proletarian class nature of the socialist state and of the communist party aims at degenerating and undermining the socialist order, at hampering the construction of socialism and communism, therefore it can not but be considered a betrayal pure and simple.

In proceeding towards eliminating the revolutionary party of the working class in the USSR N. Khrushchev's group made another step following the 22nd Congress: they «reorganized» the whole party on the «basis of production», motivating this with the pretext of «concretizing» the leadership of the party, of «closely linking» the work of the party with the practice of communist edification and so on. Two parallel organizations, one for industry and one for agriculture, were set up every where in the same territory. The substance of all this «reorganization» is to alienate the organizations of the party from political problems and the direction of all their attention to purely economic matters, the substitution of the political managers in the party with purely economic managers.

This is an open departure from great Lenin's teachings who has strongly emphasized that in class society, and especially under the dictatorship of the proletariat of socialist society, «politics can not but hold priority on economy. To judge differently, means to forget the abc of marxism» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 32, page 62). This means that every economic problem should be viewed in a political prism, should be subjugated to the basic objectives of the working class expressed in a concentrated way in its policy: the triumph of socialist relations and the construction of the classless communist society, the fight against capitalism and imperialism for the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale. Under these circumstances and in order to successfully fulfil its historic mission the working class needs a strong **political** guidance and the communist party is, and cannot fail to be first and foremost mainly a **political** party of the working class which, for this reason, directs the economy and the whole process of construction of socialism and communism. Whereas the so-called «reorganization of the party on the basis of production» which N. Khrushchev's group has worked out, aims, in fact at turning the political party of the working class into a purely economic organization, which in essence means its liquidation.

UNDER PRETEXT OF «FIGHTING THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL» THE REVISIONISTS HAVE FLUNG THE DOOR OPEN TO THE PENETRATION OF BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY.

In the 1963 July 14 open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union it is said that whoever uphold Stalin upholds also the ideology that flourished during the period of the cult of the individual. But what ideology thrived in the Soviet Union during Stalin's time? It was the ideology of marxism-leninism by which the Communist Party under Stalin's lead was consistently guided. It was the ideology of scientific socialism which became, for the first time in history, a reality in the Soviet Union under Lenin's and later Stalin's leadership. Rising against this ideology N. Khrushchev's group reveal their features of renegates to marxism-leninism and their real objective to replace it with revisionism and opportunism.

J.V. Stalin was a strong and indomitable opponent of manifestations of any kind of bourgeois ideology, open or under guise in all the phases of spiritual life. He abided faithfully by Lenin's important teachings that any slackening of the struggle against bourgeois ideology leads inevitably to the increase of its influence among the workers.

As a consistent and loyal revolutionary to the vital interests of the working class and the laboring masses, J.V. Stalin has faithfully upheld

the principles of marxism-leninism and has waged a bitter struggle against the ideological enemies of marxism-leninism — against the legal marxists, economists, anarchists, menshevíks and opportunists of all kinds within the ranks of the communist and workers movement in Russia as well as abroad in the international arena. «Our Party», Stalin wrote, «would not have been able to take the correct road, would not have managed to seize power and organize the dictatorship of the proletariat, it would not have come off victorious in the civil war if it had the Martovs and Danes, Potresovs and Axelrods» (J.V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, page 189, Albanian edition).

When death wrested V.I. Lenin from the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the international communist movement, the heavy but glorious task of keeping intact Lenin's instructions evolved upon J.V. Stalin as leader of the party and of the Soviet state, it fell on J.V. Stalin to put into execution the leninist plan of building socialism in the Soviet Union in open combat with the opportunists and revisionists of all kinds — the Trotzkyites, Zinovievists, Bukharinists and bourgeois nationalists, who rose against the general line of the party, against leninism. In this combat of principle against the various opportunist and anti-leninist groups, J.V. Stalin ingenously defended the basic principles, the basis of leninism, concretized, enriched and furthered them, universalizing the new experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union, the new expe-

rience of the international communist movement. The theoretical works written by J.V. Stalin during this period, such as «On the bases of leninism», «About questions of leninism», «Once more on the social-democratic deviation in our Party», «On the right-wing deviation in the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of the Soviet Union», «On matters pertaining to the agrarian policy in the USSR» and others occupy a significant place in the heritage of marxism-leninism, place J. V. Stalin among the ranks of the most outstanding marxist theoreticians.

Assessing the importance of principle of the fight against opportunism, J.V. Stalin regarded this as an imperative condition in raising the fighting capacity of the communist party and in strengthening it further. «The party becomes strong by cleansing it from opportunist elements», J.V. Stalin wrote. «This is an historical exigency, a law of development of every revolutionary party, of every marxist-leninist party».

This lesson of Stalin's is more than actual in our days. The war of principle which the marxist-leninist parties and all the revolutionary communists are waging today against N. Khrushchev's modern revisionists and their followers, is a war to keep the communist and workers parties from degenerating into social-democratic ones, a war to set up parties of the new type, of the leninist type, capable of successfully leading the revolutionary struggle against capitalism and imperialism, it is a war to consolidate and develop the international workers movement on the unwavering basis of marxism-leninism.

J.V. Stalin has great merits also for his struggle of principle waged against opportunism in the international communist and workers movement both when Lenin was alive and after his death, in the ranks of the Comintern. J.V. Stalin has followed with interests the activities of the various communist and workers parties, has helped them to embark on the right marxist-leninist road, detecting and fighting deviations and manifestations of opportunism within their ranks, as is the case in the German Communist Party, in the French Communist Party and in other parties.

One great merit of J.V. Stalin's in this direction is, no doubt, the detection of the revisionist deviation of Tito's clique on the basis of a deep scientific marxist-leninist analysis of the situation in the Jugoslav Communist Party. This detection at its very embrion of the revisionist trend appearing in Jugoslavia, was of great importance, was a major contribution to all marxist-leninist parties to guard them from ideological deviation, to orientate them correctly in both theory and practice, to successfully fight Jugoslav revisionism, to consolidate the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers movement on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

The development of events in Jugoslavia eversince the publication of the letters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Resolution of the Informative Bureau on the situation in the Jugoslav Communist Party, the attitude and

splitting, undermining and anti-socialist conduct of Tito's clique, both in the theoretical as well as political and practical field, have fully corroborated the accuracy and correctness of the conclusions reached by J.V. Stalin, by the Informative Bureau and by the Moscow Declarations on the revisionist deviation of Tito's clique, on the betrayal on their part of the interests of the Jugoslav working class, of the socialist camp, of the communist movement, of the international proletariat, to the benefit of the basic strategy of the American imperialists.

So long as Stalin stood at the head of the Communist Party and of the Socialist State, marxism-leninism was preserved pure, socialist ideology was kept unmarred, at irreconcilable battle with all kinds of foreign bourgeois and non-proletarian influences. But with the usurpation of the leadership of the party and of the state by N. Khrushchev and his group, the doors were flung open for widespread penetration of all kinds of anti-marxist and anti-socialist views, tendencies and influences in the whole front of spiritual life in the Soviet Union.

Many articles and public materials of our party and of other marxist-leninist parties have already clarified in detail that the so-called fight of Khrushchev's group «against Stalin's cult of the individual and its consequences» was used first and foremost to rehabilitate the renegates of marxism-leninism wherever they were, ranging from the Trotzkyites, Bukharinists and their ilk to Tito's treacherous clique. It was used to revive and spread, as «discoveries» and «creative

development» of marxism, the opportunist theories of Bernstein, Kautzky, Bukharin, Brauder, of the right-wing leaders of present social-democracy and of the Titoite clique, covered under a «new» Khrushchevian shell. The question of the cult of the individual was used to revise the basic theses of marxism-leninism on the class struggle, on the revolution, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the revolutionary party, on imperialism, on war and peace, on the national-liberation movement and so on.

But the spread of opportunism and revisionism is only one side of the evil. Now the manifestations of bourgeois degeneration in the field of ideology, of culture and art, in the manner of living are becoming more frequent and more deplorable in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries where the leadership is in the hands of revisionists, a thing which has aroused (and could not help arouse) deep concern and protest, be it even in silence, among the sound persons of the ideological, cultural and art and other fronts.

In their attempts to cover up their tracks, to mask their goal and the dangerous consequences of their revisionist line in the field of spiritual life, N. Khrushchev's group resort to all kinds of maneuvers. They try to persuade people that Stalin allegedly hampered the free creative activity of the men of culture, of the writers and artists, while N. Khrushchev is claimed to have opened unbounded horizons for creative production in culture and art. But it is a fact that the talents of Gorky, of Maya-

kovsky and of Fadeyev, of Stanislavsky and of Eisenstein thrived in Stalin's time and under Stalin's patronage; the «Quiet Don» and the «Cracked Earth», «How Steel Was Tempered» and «The Young Guard», the films «The Potyomkin Cruiser» and «Chapayev» as well as many masterpieces of Soviet letters and art, based on the principles of socialist realism were produced during his time.

And what are the consequences of N. Khrushchev's «new trend» in the field of literature and art? The inevitable offspring of this revisionist trend are the waverings, the instability, the ideological hotch-potch, the widespread of the trends of decadent bourgeois art in the Soviet Union. Taking heart from N. Khrushchev's unprincipled and anti-marxist stand towards Stalin and his work, certain cosmopolitan individuals, bearing many flags, among the ranks of Soviet writers and artists, launched also a frenzied campaign against Stalin's work and the whole historic epoch connected with his name, a frenzied campaign to correct «the mistakes and shortcomings» to «overcome the consequences of the cult of the individual». Here too, under the slogan of fighting against «Stalin's cult of the individual», marxism-leninism and the method of socialist realism received a blow while revisionism propped up its head like a dark shadow. And true enough a cross was lightly drawn on almost all the Soviet literature produced during the thirty-year long period of Stalin's leadership. And not only this, but all the magnificent realizations of Soviet society to which this litera-

ture sang praises were questioned and were depicted in dark colors. V.I. Lenin's theses and the decisions of the party on literature and art were widely attacked and a general assault was launched against all the theoretic marxist-leninist basis of artistic productions by socialist writers and artists preaching the bourgeois idea of ideological coexistence in the field of art, the full freedom of the various trends in art. In fact, an end was put to the fight against bourgeois ideology in art, which has been one of the most important characteristics of marxist-leninist critique and aesthetics and whoever raised his voice in defense of socialist realism, in defense of partisanship in art, was designated as a «Stalinist», as «a dogmatist», who has not «understood the spirit of the decisions of the 20th Congress» and so on and so forth.

But where the fight against evil ceases, the evil reigns, where the fight against bourgeois ideology ceases, bourgeois ideology reigns. Abstractionism and formalism propped up their head at first timidly and then more courageously. And now they have gone so far as to organize in Moscow exhibitions of the productions of «Soviet» abstractionist and formalist painters. Forgotten are revolutionary traditions, historic optimism of Soviet literature and decadent works, slandering and discrediting works like A. Solzhenichin's narrative «Ivan Denisovich's One Day» which in its essence denies the Soviet power itself, began to be published with a large circulation of 50 to 100 thousand copies each. Others even went so far in their

zeal to re-examine and criticize all the historic period of development in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin, representing this as a period of violence and of crimes, during which people acted differently and thought differently and felt obliged to lead a double-faced life, as to place the one who urged them into this path — Khrushchev — in a precarious position and to call him into account for the «crimes» of the past.

Compelled by sound Soviet artistic opinion, which began to offer resistance to these alien trends, N. Khrushchev «criticized» some writers and artists who «had overstepped their bounds». But N. Khrushchev's demagogy is clearly evident in the fact that on one hand he «criticized» these people and their works whereas, on the other, he enccuraged them to write again as before, recommending to them as a model, as an example to be pursued, works of the same trend, departing from the principles of socialist realism and from the best traditions of Soviet literature, that slander against the socialist order and spread the poison of bourgeois ideology, like, for instance, Tvardovsky's poems «Far and Farther Away» and «Vasili Tyorkin in the next world», A. Solzhenichin's narrative «Ivan Denisovich's One Day», some poems by E. Yevtushenko, G. Chuhrait's film «Clear Sky» or the film «Serenity» and other works of an entirely anti-socialist spirit.

Many other facts speak of the penetration of bourgeois ideology into the Soviet Union, to wit: the hundreds and thousands of American «tour-

ists» and from other capitalist countries who visit the Soviet Union every year, the widespread exchange of artists, sportsmen and sportswomen, men of culture, businessmen, ministers and senators, the free circulation of decadent western books, periodicals, newspapers and films, free exchange of radio and television broadcasts and so on and so forth. And all of these are done at a time when all doors are closed to cultural and artistic exchanges with the socialist countries standing on marxist-leninist grounds, when all precautions are taken to keep people from hearing Radio Pekin and Radio Tirana, and when written material from marxist-leninist parties are banned to enter the country. The consequences of this course are becoming more and more evident and in ever growing proportions among the youth and the working masses of the Soviet Union where moral depravity, no interest in politics, pursuance of the western way of living, running after the rags of tourists, idealization of everything foreign, vagrancy and hooliganism have become so serious as to make the present revisionist leaders themselves stand up and take notice.

Such are the consequences of the Khrushchevian course of all round «peaceful coexistence» with the imperialists brought about under the signal of «fighting against Stalin's cult of the individual». Very significant are the statements made by the Ambassador of the United States of America to the USSR, Foy Kohler, before the American senate that «The Voice of America «is no longer intercepted in the Soviet

Union, that it is heard clearly, that more important American material is now published in the Soviet Union, that the Soviet journalists are eager to write a good deal on life in the USA and in «a way more or less favorable for us» (that is, favorable according to the conception of the representative of the American imperialists), and so on. On June 1, this year, too Foy Kohler, while undersigning the consular convention between the USA and the USSR, stated: «I hope that this convention, which should be the code to govern our consular relations, will become a symbol to warrant a growing exchange of persons, goods and ideas between our countries and in this way it will be an important contribution to the attainment of this end». Foy Kohler and his employers have a right to be satisfied when they see the brilliant consequences of the open door for the influence of reactionary bourgeois ideology to penetrate freely into the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries.

Every passing day throws new light on the attempts of the modern revisionists to renounce the revolutionary doctrine of marxism-leninism and to open the way for the various trends of bourgeois ideology to flourish in socialist countries. Thus, the 1963 December issue of «La Nouvelle Critique» dedicated to «Reflection on the cult of the individual» expresses among others the idea that the spread of marxism in socialist countries has also its negative sides. And which are these? It goes on to say that one of the reasons that brought its influence to bear on the rise of «the cult of the individual» and

on the spread of «dogmatism» in socialist countries is «the danger which state pedagogy offers». In this connection the following explanation is given: «One is well aware of the advantages which marxism enjoys in socialist countries; they are the same advantages from which the various forms of the prevailing bourgeois ideology profit in capitalist countries. But one is also aware of the unsuitable side: the danger that marxism may be treated in the official system of education as the word official (under the symbol of authority rather than that of critical verification). And as a consequence, there is the danger that it may be accepted by the less advanced part of the masses for its prestige as much for the fact of its being a ruling ideology, and even more than for its scientific value. Less for the fact that it is true than for the fact that it is being taught. Just the same as bourgeois ideology which is accepted at present, first and foremost, because it is established». (pp. 18 & 19).

But what are these people after? Do they want that the study of marxism be cancelled from state education in the socialist countries? Or do they want that these countries should give free play and support the preaching of the various currents of bourgeois ideology? The truth is that there is nothing new in this: it was exactly this that the Polish revisionists demanded some time ago following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And the results were soon apparent: the increase of clerical reaction, even in state schools; intensification of the influence of reactionary, decadent

bourgeois trends in ideology, art and culture and, closely connected with all these, the counter-revolutionary events of 1956 in Poland.

There is, therefore, no doubt that the renunciation of marxism, its replacement with bourgeois ideology, make up one of the main aspects of the attempts of the modern revisionists, with N. Khrushchev's group at the head, to degenerate the socialist order under the pretext of fighting against «the cult of the individual and its consequences».

THE ANTI-STALINIST COURSE OF THE KHRUSHCHEVIAN REVISIONISTS IS THE COURSE OF CAPITALIST DEGENERATION OF SOCIALIST ECONOMY

More than once has N. Khrushchev hurled attacks and reproaches on J. Stalin accusing him of being ignorant of economic matters, of standing aloof from life, of not knowing what was going on in the Soviet Union, and of drawing up decisions on economic matters from his office and so on and so forth. N. Khrushchev's group have discarded the whole system of management of economy and state affair existing at Stalin's time, while, on the other hand, they boast to the utmost of their «innovations» in the field of economic management, presenting them as the last word in the «creative development» of the theory and practice of socialist economy. In the 1963 July 14 Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union it is even said that whoever upholds Stalin and his work, he upholds «those forms and methods of management that thrived under the conditions of the cult of the individual».

We wish to ask: What were the forms and methods of management in Stalin's time, what was the economic policy which the party and the Soviet government pursued under his leadership, which N. Khrushchev's group now attack and discard? What were the consequences of this policy, of these forms and methods of management? And with what policy and «new methods» of management have N. Khrushchev's group replaced them? What is the essence of these Khrushchevian «innovations» and what are its effects on Soviet economy?

Guided by the leninist teachings on building socialism and communism, defending these teachings at daggers drawn from the enemies of leninism like the Trotzkyites and Bukharinists and their ilk, and developing them on the basis of universalizing the practical experience of socialist construction in the USSR, J.V. Stalin worked out a correct marxist-leninist line of action and led with success the historic struggle of all the Soviet people in building socialist society.

This was the line of the socialist industrialization of the country. J.V. Stalin did not only argue the possibility of complete edification of socialism in backward Russia surrounded on all sides by the mad waves of world capitalism, but elaborated the ways and methods of the socialist industrialization of the country relying

on its own resources as well. As a result of the application of this correct line of action the Soviet Union set up, under the wise and resolute leadership of Stalin, a strong industrial basis in a comparatively short period of time, not only without any help from abroad, but by heroically overcoming all difficulties and obstacles caused by the international bourgeoisie, who tried to stifle Soviet economy through blockades and the «cordons sanitaire». Within only three five-year planned periods Russia, formerly backward and dependent economically on foreign capital, became an advanced industrial state of immense defensive capacity and entirely independent economically from the capitalist world.

Under Stalin's correct leadership the land of the Soviets carried out the greatly complicated historical task of transforming the small scattered individual farms on socialist basis through collectivization of agriculture. This was a profound revolution in economic relations solving once for all time the peasant problem, saved the peasantry from exploitation, ruin and misery, set up a sound socialist basis for the Soviet social and state order in the countryside and placed Soviet agriculture on the basis of modern large-scale production. N. Khrushchev's statements in his speech at the Soviet-Polish meeting in Moscow on April 15, 1964, pretending that the peasants were forced to join in kholkhoses, that «no successes could be spoken of at that time since people died of starvation» are nothing less than odious slanders aimed at discrediting the kholkhosian order and the idea of collectiviza-

tion itself. This goes to show that N. Khrushchev stands wholly at the level of the most reactionary anti-communist propaganda.

Parallel with socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization the Soviet Union realized under Stalin's leadership, its cultural revolution, which pulled the broad masses of the people out from darkness and ignorance and placed the land of the Soviets in the ranks of the most advanced countries in the field of culture, education and science.

The reproaches of N. Khrushchev's group claiming that Stalin hindered the progress of science and technique in the Soviet Union, while N. Khrushchev seems to have the great merit of pulling them out of the inertness in which Stalin had left them, are ridiculous and arouse contempt. Thus, for instance, Stalin is reproached with having hampered research work on the atomic bomb in the Soviet Union before the Second World War and a lot of noise is made that the merit for the remarkable achievements attained in the Soviet Union in the field of atomic energy, of rockets, of mastering space and other important fields evolves on N. Khrushchev. We sincerely rejoice and heartily hail these brilliant achievements of Soviet science and technique. But the merit for them do not at all belong to Khrushchev, despite the great noise made to call him «the father of the technique of rockets» and the «pioneer of air space». People are justified in asking: On what scientific and technical basis have the present achievements of Soviet science and technique been attained?

On what economic basis were these realizations made possible, as they require colossal funds? Which scientists have produced these marvels — the students of 1956 or those who have been at work in the laboratories and science centers of the Soviet Union for tens of years at a stretch? It is clear to every one that without general development of the economy of the Soviet Union, without an extensive network of educational and scientific institutions, without the successful accomplishment of the cultural revolution in the Soviet Union, without the immense progress of Soviet science and technique, without the forty-year long progress of all the branches of science, no present achievements of Soviet science and technique could be thought of, which in reality are the acme of the creative genius of man, but, like all peaks, could not exist without a sound basis, without the great achievements which the Soviet Union attained under the leadership of Stalin, who rendered a very important historic contribution in directing the whole country towards the progress of science and technique and the training of cadres for these sectors of socialist construction. The atomic bombs and those with hydrogen were created as early as Stalin's time, atomic energy for peaceful purposes was used for the first time during Stalin's time; and the work for producing rockets had already begun during Stalin's time.

No matter how hard the revisionists may try, their slanders and trumped up charges are in no condition to obscure the fact that it was under Stalin's wise marxist-leninist leadership

that the great teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin were put into practice in the Soviet Union for the first time in history, that socialist society was established. To Stalin belongs the great historical merit for universalizing in his works the basic experience of socialist construction in the USSR which serves as a beacon to light the way for all countries who embark on the road to socialism. J.V. Stalin rendered a valuable contribution also to the thesaurus of marxism-leninism in connection with the ways and problems of crossing over from socialism to communism, of building classless communist society.

As far as Stalin's methods of directing and building socialism are concerned, every one knows that they are the well-known marxist-leninist methods of democratic centralization, of relying strongly on the broad masses of workers, of persuading and educating people and of criticism and self-criticism. These are the methods and forms of management which activated all the Soviet people and brought about the first socialist society in the world, which assured the historic victory in the Great Patriotic War and led the Soviet Union towards communism.

Such are the facts. And what «new» thing have N. Khrushchev and his group brought who have risen against the economic line of building socialism pursued by Stalin, against the forms and methods of management which he practiced?

During the years N. Khrushchev's group are in power, a series of measures have been taken and «reorganizations» have been made in the field of economy in the Soviet Union

which have been loudly spoken of. In reality, these measures and reorganizations are essentially a dangerous distortion of the economic principles governing socialist construction and lead to the degeneration of the socialist order of things.

The general trend of Khrushchevian reorganizations in economy is, above all, the decentralization of the management of economy and the transfer of the management of economy from such political organs as the soviets, to purely economic organs like the councils of people's economy. Khrushchevian «reorganizations» remind us, on one hand, «the experience» of the decentralization of economy of the Jugoslav revisionist clique, the so-called system of «self-administration of workers», which he sang praises to during his last official visit to Jugoslavia in September last year, expressing also the desire and willingness to make a study of and apply them in the Soviet Union. The western press was not far from the truth when it wrote those days with jubilation that Titoite Jugoslavia serves as a «transmission belt to convey the economic ideas of the West to the East». On the other hand, N. Khrushchev's reforms remind us of the attempts of Lenin's opponents during the early years of Soviet rule, to wrest the management of economy from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to transfer it to the so-called «Congress of producers». It is known that Lenin has bitterly condemned these views, designating them as very dangerous anarchical-syndicalist tendencies jeopardizing the future of socialism.

N. Khrushchev's group are making a lot of noise year in and year out in connection with the question of «material stimuli» as the motive force in building socialism and communism. They have more than once accused J. Stalin as if he «used to violate the socialist principle of the material stimulus», lowering in this way the workers efficiency and interest in work and so on. Also in report read on February 28 this year in connection with the carrying out the decisions of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the intensification of agricultural production, N. Khrushchev make such reproaches, saying: «The Party (read: N. Khrushchev — editors) has condemned the anti-kholkhosian policy of prices practiced during Stalin's time, when the prices were so low that the kholkhoses could not compensate the expenses incurred for their products with the money they received from their sale... The labor of most kholkhosians was, in fact, not paid for». We need not dwell long to prove that we have here to do with another attempt to discredit the socialist order in general and the kholkhosian order in particular, because, according to N. Khrushchev, it turns out that the kholkhosian village in the Soviet Union seems to have been a veritable inferno where people seem to have lived almost under the same conditions as slaves and villeins, the products of whose toil was appropriated by others. But this gives rise to a simple question: If, as Khrushchev says, «the labor of most of the kholkhosians was in fact not paid for» then on

what did these people and their families subsist, how did they keep alive? It is evident that we have here to do with a detestable calumny and not a clever one either.

In fact, it is N. Khrushchev and his group who have badly distorted the socialist principle of distribution according to work done, placing the «personal material interest» above everything else. They have altogether forgotten about moral stimuli, communist training and socialist emulation as a great force of progress of society towards communism, of mobilizing workers for work in building socialism and communism. In the above report of February 28, 1964 too, N. Khrushchev said that of first rank importance in creating communist society is «to utilize the great force of material stimuli», that «we should proceed courageously and resolutely towards material stimulation», that in order to utilize the reserves to increase production « we should pick out people, train them and interest them materially», that «those who have attained high results.... should be paid well, even if it be two and one-half or three times the present pay» and in order to speed up the day when communism will have been built, when the state will have ceased to exist and money will have disappeared and everything will rely on communist conscience « we should see to it today that material stimuli may not be lacking, that people may be encouraged to turn out higher yields in their work», that «in striving to create the economic basis of communism, we should not neglect the material factor, we are not justified in being

idealists, visionaries, people standing aloof from life and ignoring the demands of the people» and so on and so forth.

Of course no one denies the importance of material stimuli in socialist society, the marxist-leninists are even dead set against equal distribution under conditions of socialism for this would stifle any stimulus in work. But to depend for everything on the personal material interest alone would actually mean to depart from the principle of harmonizing the personal with the social interests, of subjugating the personal interests to the interests of the community in socialism. This inevitably leads to neglecting the interests of the community, to placing the personal interests above those of society, encourages people to devote their attention to personal gains and wealth and make a fetish of it, mars their socialist conscience, arouses in them the remnants of capitalism, leads to reviving the tendencies of bourgeois individualism and gives rise to all kinds of anti-socialist parasites and speculators. Facts go to prove that this is exactly what is happening today in the Soviet Union. And how can one speak of building communism under such conditions, when it is well known that the realization of this requires the training of workers to have a much higher conscience, to work with all their efforts with no economic obligation whatsoever, without a check on the quantity of work and of consumption?

N. Khrushchev's thesis on «the personal material interests» as «the driving force of develop-

ment of socialist production» as «a basis for the increase of production, for raising output in work», as «a great force in building communism», is openly at variance with the teachings of great Lenin, who pointing out the historical importance of the «Communist Saturday» wrote in his well known pamphlet «The Great Initiative»: «Communim begins where the self-sacrificing concern, overcoming hard work, is manifested among the plain workers to raise the yield in work, to save each bushel of wheat, coal, iron and of other products which are received not by him personally, not by his «kith and kin» but «society as a whole», the tens and millions of people, united at first in a socialist state and then in the Union of the Soviet Republics» (underlined by the editors) (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 29, page 394). Taking account of this basic characteristic, of this kernel of the «Communist Sabaths», Lenin wrote: «This is the beginning of a harder, more essential, more fundamental, more decisive turn than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, because this is the victory over the routine, disintegration and egoism of the petty bourgeoisie itself, over these habits which the cursed capitalism have left as an inheritance to the workers and peasants. When this victory is consolidated, then and only then will the new social discipline, the socialist discipline, be set up, then and only then will the return to capitalism be made impossible and communism will really become insuperable (idem, pp 379 & 380).

Whereas N. Khrushchev is trying to turn Soviet society backwards, towards capitalism.

One of the results of his policy of «the material personal interests» and, apparently, one of his main objectives is to create a privileged class of people, a new «aristocracy», which, proceeding from their narrow interests, will support the revisionist, anti-socialist, anti-revolutionary and nationalist line of N. Khrushchev and his traitorous group. It is precisely the setting up of such a class of privileged people that makes up the social basis of the spread of revisionism in certain socialist countries today. It should be pointed out that the so-called principle of «the personal material stimulus» lies at the root of the whole Jugoslav system of «workers self-administration», which, as every one knows, is one of the main directions of turning Jugoslav economy towards capitalism.

But this is not all. In the above February 28 report, N. Khrushchev openly called for adopting the experience of the system of remuneration practiced by the American capitalist farmers in carrying out the principle «of material stimuli» in agriculture. This is not the first time N. Khrushchev expresses his admiration for the American system. Apparently, the USA has become the ideal towards which N. Khrushchev and his group of renegates are trying to head for!

Through his «creative discoveries» N. Khrushchev has trifled with the idea of communism. In one of his speeches during his recent visit to Hungary he went so far as to reduce the ideal of communism and the struggle for communism to an effort to fill the belly with a dish of gulash.

It is clear that such a commonplace, petty bourgeois conception has nothing in common with the marxist-leninist doctrine of scientific communism and leads in an inevitable way to departure from proletarian internationalism, from supporting the revolutionary movement in other countries, it leads to a narrow egotism and nationalism. The American daily «The New York Times» is far from wrong when it publishes a leading article in its April 3, 1964 issue under the heading «Moscow's Gulyash Communism» in which it writes: «His paradise is an identical copy of the American political slogan «two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pan» And further:» Nicolai Bukharin, Soviet theoretician, who called upon the Russian farmers in 1920 to make themselves rich by increasing production for the city workers, would have approved N. Khrushchev's present line of action. The French and German social-democrats of the latter part of the XIX and the first part of the XX century would have likewise approved this line, because in the past they deemed it as their first duty to produce as much as possible for workers rather than concern themselves so much about overthrowing the existing institutions through revolutions». This is very clear and needs no comment.

Or let us take the policy of N. Khrushchev's group in the field of agriculture. It is known that N. Khrushchev and his followers have madly attacked the policy which Stalin pursued in agriculture and have taken a series of measure in this direction seemingly to pull agriculture

out of the backwardness in which Stalin seems to have left it. A great noise was raised especially about opening up new lands, abolishing the Motor and Tractor Stations as well as raising more maize. The authors of these measures proclaimed them as measures that would come to the rescue of farming, that would double agricultural products, that would, in a few years, come up to the level of the USA and other advanced capitalist countries in the per capita production of agricultural products, that would create abundancy and bring about the lowering of prices on agricultural and livestock products.

But can the break up of the Motor and Tractor Stations and the sale of farm machinery to the kholkhoses be considered a measure that helps in developing the forces of production in the countryside, and in speeding up the rate of progress towards communism, as N. Khrushchev's group try make believe? In his book on «the economic problems of socialism in the USSR» which N. Khrushchev at the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union called «an invaluable contribution to the theory of marxism-leninism, arming the party and the Soviet people with the doctrine on the conditions of transition from socialism to communism», Stalin rightly calls a measure of this kind entirely erroneous and very dangerous, because:

Firstly, the kholkhoses, however strong they may be from the economic point of view, cannot speed up technical progress in agriculture with their own means; this can be done only by the socialist state. Therefore, he stressed by sell-

ing the machines to the kholkhoses «would mean to cause great loss to the kholkhoses, to ruin them, to undermine mechanization of agriculture, to lower the rate of production in the kholkhoses».

Secondly, a measure of this kind places the kholkhoses in the privileged position of owners of the principal means of production, a thing which the workers of the other state enterprises do not enjoy. This does not at all bring kholkhosian property nearer to the general property of the whole people, but, on the contrary, moves it away and thus hampers the process of crossing over from socialism to communism.

Thirdly, this measure broadens the sphere of activity in the circulation of goods since a large quantity of agricultural production means enter into the orbit of circulation of goods, a thing which creates supplementary difficulties to the progress towards communism.

And subsequent events have gone to prove that Stalin was altogether right.

Thereby hangs a question: What are the «brilliant consequences» of the policy of N. Khrushchev's group in the field of agriculture? Here are the facts:

On June 1, 1962, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the USSR addressed to the people of the Soviet Union a letter in which they informed them that the retail prices of meat and meat products were raised 30% on the average and that those of butter and its pro-

ducts 25%. In this letter they read: «the party and the government consider it necessary to speak frankly about the difficulties that are being met with in providing the population of cities with meat products». Thus the Soviet people very soon tested «the advantages» of N. Khrushchev's reforms. A similar fiasco was shared also by N. Khrushchev's loud promise that by 1959-60 the population would be exempted from taxation and the workday would be shortened without a cut in wages, a thing which has not been put into effect to this day. In the same way N. Khrushchev was obliged to buy over ten million tons of grain from Canada, Australia, the United States of America and elsewhere, in order to meet the needs of the country, a thing which is unprecedented phenomenon in the history of the Soviet Union which has always been an exporter of wheat.

Whatever justifications he may offer, N. Khrushchev cannot possibly hush up his defeats and his responsibilities. He cannot be saved from either the repeated dismissals of the Ministers of Agriculture or of other cadres in Kazakistan, Ryazan and elsewhere or his attempts to blame the system of travopolye or trumped up charges against Stalin. In his impudence he went so far as to state at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party that it was true that during Stalin's and Molotov's time grain was sold abroad but «in certain regions people suffered from hunger and even starved because of lack of grain». And this seems to have happened exactly

in 1947! But even this biased and malicious statement for the Soviet power itself cannot come to N. Khrushchev's rescue. The whole world knows that it was exactly during this year that the card system of rations limiting the purchase of bread was lifted in the Soviet Union. It is likewise known that it was precisely during this period that the Soviet Union aided the peoples of the other countries who had embarked on the road to socialism, to rescue them from imminent starvation and in order not to stretch their hands to the imperialist powers. This was a deeply internationalist gesture and we Albanians know it too well from our own experience.

A very grave situation was created in our country following the war in 1946, in connection with the bread problem. Many work hands had left the countryside to join the national-liberation Army of the people voluntarily, one-third of the livestock had been exterminated by the ravages of war, draft animals had suffered special loss; the weather conditions were far from favorable for agriculture. Under these circumstances whole regions were threatened with starvation. Reactionaries in the country and abroad rubbed their hands. But in these days of hardships the Soviet Government headed by J.V. Stalin responded to the request of the Albanian Government and gave our people an immediate help in wheat, which rescued them from starvation and helped them frustrate the plans of reaction. And this took place one year after the war which caused so much devastation and losses to the Soviet Union. How is it then possible

to help rescue others from hunger and at the same time to let one's own people suffer and even die of starvation?

A grave situation was created in our country regarding the provision of bread for the population also in 1960 mainly because of the great draught unmet with for years. This year too the Albanian Government turned to the Soviet Government for aid. But what was the latter's reply? At first they told us that they had difficulties to fill our request, although when N. Khrushchev visited Albania in 1959 he had said: «the amount of wheat Albania consumes in one year is equal to what the mice eat in the Soviet Union»; later on, when we expressed our willingness to buy the amount of corn we needed by payment of cash, they said that they would sell it but only on cash payment in gold. And when we agreed to buy it on payment of cash in gold, they refused to sell us the wheat. These are all documented.

These are the facts bespeaking two diametrically opposed attitudes: Stalin's deeply internationalist attitude and a bad peddler's attitude of N. Khrushchev, who cherished the idea that he would be able to force our party and our people to their knees by pressures and threats.

Of «interest» are also N. Khrushchev's zigzags, his acrobatic stunts to come out of the blind alley into which he has led himself through his policy in agriculture. At the beginning he proposed the extension of areas under cultivation as a general line to raise agricultural production and drew up a plan to reclaim new land for which

colossal sums of money were spent. Whereas in the 1963 December plenum Khrushchev himself posed the question: Is it more profitable to expand the areas under cultivation or to raise the output of grains per hectars? And he said that investigations go to show that «it is more profitable to direct the existing means towards developing chemistry, towards producing artificial fertilizers and not in expanding the areas under cultivation». If this is so why did this «ingenious expert of agriculture» not make these accounts before, but hastened to condemn and stigmatize as «anti-party» elements those persons who had upheld the view of developing the chemical industry for intensifying agriculture? Why were all those means and productive forces wasted, instead of being used to intensify agriculture since a number of years before? Who are to blame for this, Stalin, the system of travopolye, or the «old» forms of organization and management of agriculture?

Or let us take yet another example. Every one remembers what a lot of noise was raised some years ago in the Soviet Union about the raising of maize. Maize became the symbol of welfare and of abundance, the symbol of all good things, the race horse which N. Khrushchev would ride to win the stakes with the USA in agricultural production! N. Khrushchev at that time turned out to be the most ardent admirer of the maize crop, the greatest expert and most fiery propagandist of this crop. But what happened? As if nothing had been said or done N. Khrushchev now states at the 1963 December

plenum that «we do not pledge life-long allegiance to any one single crop, that we do not intend to sing hossanahs to it. We should give priority to no one single crop». Apparently maize too failed to come to his rescue. Therefore, let us put aside maize, let us forget about reclaimed land. Chemistry — this is now everything, this is our salvation!

But the development of the chemical industry requires a lot of means. To secure these N. Khrushchev did not hesitate to jeopardize even the defensive power of the Soviet Union by cutting down the military expenses. This is now considered a just procedure and even as a great peaceful step of the Soviet Government, which, as the Soviet press itself points out, was taken at the very time when the imperialist powers decided at the meeting of the council of NATO in Paris last December to increase military expenses and to speed up work creating the multilateral nuclear forces. But let us remind our readers of how N. Khrushchev justified the rise in prices of meat and butter and of their products one and one-half years ago. In the letter addressed to the Soviet people on this occasion it is said that the prices would not have been raised if the defensive power of the country would have been affected, but the party and government could not take this risk at a time when the imperialist powers nourished and concocted aggressive plans against the Soviet Union! And the question rightly arises: What has happened? How is it that what was impossible to be done in the middle of 1962 is possible to be done at the end of 1963? Can the

imperialists, with the USA in the lead, have given up preparing for war and their aggressive plans? No, nothing has changed. On the contrary, the risk of war has become more imminent as a result of the ignoble Moscow Treaty and of N. Khrushchev's unprincipled concessions and compromises. Then what? There is nothing here to be wondered at. We have here to do with only the manifestation of N. Khrushchev's pragmatism which runs through all his policy and practical activity, and his highest principle is that everything is good, just and true when it is profitable, when it brings benefits at the present moment.

Let us point to yet another interesting «detail». Formerly N. Khrushchev «bitterly criticized» the Jugoslav leaders, who claimed they were building socialism with American dollars and used to pose the question: What socialism is this that is being aided and supported by the imperialists? Whereas now N. Khrushchev himself is shamelessly stretching his palms to the American imperialists. In the 1963 December plenum on developing the chemical industry, N. Khrushchev touched the problem of credits which could be received from the Western countries and in a conversation with a group of American businessmen he proposed that they invest their capital in the Soviet Union giving them at the same time guarantees in behalf of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, assuring them that they would derive good profits from their investments. Every man can rightfully pose the same question which N. Khrushchev himself had posed some time ago: What

kind of communism is this that can be built with the aid and credits of the capitalists, with American dollars? Soliciting aid and credits from the West is not only humiliating for the Soviet Union but also a big step backward of soviet socialist economy towards forms of state capitalism existing to a small extent in the early years of Soviet power. And all of this takes place at a time when N. Khrushchev makes a lot of noise about laying the basis of communist society by the year 1980!

It is a fact that though J. V. Stalin lived and worked at a time when the Soviet Union had to overcome innumerable difficulties, he, contrary to N. Khrushchev's present policy of capitulation, held aloft the honor and prestige of the land of the Soviets and never stretched out his hands to the imperialists for almsgiving.

Thus the incontestable facts go to prove ever so clearly that the line which N. Khrushchev and his renegate group follow so persistently under the guise of the so-called «fight against Stalin's cult of the individual and its consequences» is in reality the line of capitalist degeneration of socialist economy in the tracks of Titoite Jugoslavia.

THE ANTI-STALINIST LINE IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN POLICY IS THAT OF CAPITULATION TO AND UNITY WITH THE CAPITALISTS

The various written materials of N. Khrushchev's group and of other revisionists, like Suslov's report to the 1964 February plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev's speeches in Hungary and his followers' addresses at the pompous ceremonies commemorating N. Khrushchev's 70th birthday, repeated the slanders and the unscrupulous trumped up charges against the leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union pursued heretofore by Stalin and ever since by the communist parties and governments of the socialist countries faithful to marxism-leninism, to the cause of socialism. «With the present political course of the leaders of the Communist Party of China as an example» Suslov's report has it, «the world communist movement and the conscientious workers of the whole world are being further convinced of the viciousness of the practice of the cult of the individual, of the damage it has caused to the interests of peoples, to the great cause of fighting imperialism, to socialism.»

This is by no means casual. N. Khrushchev's group of renegates try, in this way, to justify their anti-marxist foreign policy which causes serious damage to the interests of peoples, to the socialist countries and to peace, they try

to legalize their hitherto acts of betrayal and lay the way open for further acts of this kind in the days to come by covering them up under a pseudo-marxist robe. That is why it becomes imperative to unmask these maneuvers and to lay bare what lies behind the attacks of N. Khrushchev and his supporters against the so-called «consequences of the cult of the individual» in the field of foreign policy.

Life itself is showing with ever increasing facts that as time goes on the fundamental differences between the two opposing lines in foreign policy, between J. V. Stalin's anti-imperialist, revolutionary marxist-leninist line and the opportunist, capitulating and treacherous line of N. Khrushchev and his group are becoming more and more outspoken. People are getting wiser to the fact that the assaults and accusations launched on J. V. Stalin and his foreign policy, presenting it as a «stagnant», «dogmatic», and «sectarian» policy, and Stalin himself as «credulous» and «timid» towards the imperialists and as an «adventurer» and «ignoramus» in politics, are nothing less than disgusting calumnies.

In reality J. V. Stalin has always been a great fighter against the despicable foe of the class—imperialism. As a faithful disciple of Lenin and worthy promoter of his work, J. Stalin abided by the teachings of leninism on imperialism and enriched and furthered them to suit the new conditions and phenomena. On the basis of a deep and all round analysis of the nature and contradictions of the imperialist sys-

tem, J. V. Stalin drew a series of important lessons regarding the attitude to maintain towards imperialism, regarding the problems of war, peace and peaceful coexistence, of the revolutionary and national-liberation movement which are of great importance to the whole international communist movement to this very day.

Nourish no illusions about imperialism and its leaders, always maintain a class, proletarian attitude and highest vigilance towards them — this was one of J. V. Stalin's teachings.

Imperialism is the sworn and irreconcilable foe of the socialist system. «Capitalist encirclement» Stalin used to say in 1930, «must not be taken to mean a purely geographic notion. Capitalist encirclement means that there are hostile classes around the USSR ready to come to the aid of the class enemy within the boundaries of the Soviet Union both morally, materially, through financial blockades, and, if the occasion arises, through military intervention» (J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, page 295, Albanian edition). Stalin cited many facts to show that as the land of socialism gets strong to uphold the cause of the revolution and of proletarian internationalism, the imperialists become more hostile and aggressive towards it. «To think», he used to stress, «that international capital can let the socialist country at peace to build up communism, that it can look on while the socialist country can carry out its internationalist foreign policy, would mean to be naive and to cross over to positions of bourgeois liberalism».

Proceeding from a general orientation of this kind, J. Stalin led the Party and the Soviet people towards strengthening the country in all directions, towards raising its defensive capacity in order to cope successfully with any imperialist aggression. The history of the Soviet Union as well as of the other socialist countries has proved beyond doubt that Stalin's stand in this matter was a marxist-leninist, a wise, a realistic and a farsighted one. Is this not borne out by Hitlerite Germany's attack on the Soviet Union during the years of the Second World War, or by the American imperialist aggression against the People's Democratic Republic of Corea and Cuba as well as by the numerous other hostile acts of the imperialists against socialist countries?

Imperialism is by its very nature a pitiless exploiter of workers and peoples and their ruthless foe. J. V. Stalin just as V. I. Lenin teaches us that imperialism means straight forward increase of exploitation and violence over the working masses, that imperialism is a «world system of financial enslavement and colonial oppression of the bulk of the world population by a handful of «advanced» countries (J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, page 97, Albanian edition). He has repudiated the attempts of the various bourgeois and opportunist propaganda to embellish capitalism and imperialism, to deny its deep contradictions, to spread illusions on «the good» that may come to peoples from the capitalist order.

Imperialism by its very nature is a source of wars and aggression. «Capitalism in its imperialist phase» Stalin says, «is a system of the kind which considers the war as a lawful method to settle international conflicts, a lawful method, if not juridical, at least in essence» (J. V. Stalin, «A conversation with Mr Roy Howard, director of the union of the «Scripps — Howard Newspapers» — 1937). He stressed that «imperialism cannot exist without violence and plunder, without bloodshed and bullets, and that is why it is called imperialism» (J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 9, pp. 192 & 193, Albanian edition). J.V. Stalin pointed out that by preaching peace the imperialists have only one aim: «to deceive people with bombastic phrases about peace in order to prepare for a new war» (Stalin, Works, vol. 6, page 285, Albanian edition). He also said: «Many persons think that imperialist pacifism is an instrument of peace. This is far from being true. Imperialist pacifism is an instrument of preparing for war and of covering up these preparations under hypocritical phrases about peace. Without a pacifism of this kind and without its tool, the League of Nations, preparations for war under present conditions are impossible» **(J. V. Stalin,** Works, vol. 11, page 200, Albanian edition).

Proceeding from these leninist theses Stalin considered it a duty of prime importance for the Party and the Soviet State, for all communists, to keep on exposing the aggressive and warmongering nature of imperialism, the attempts and plans of the imperialist powers to

prepare and launch wars. In his «Notes on Actual Themes» (July 1937), when the imperialists had started preparations for a new war, J. V. Stalin wrote: «It is our duty to sound the alarm in all the European countries on the outbreak of the new war, to arouse the vigilance of the workers and soldiers of the capitalist countries and to train the masses, and train them tirelessly, to meet all the attempts of the bourgeois governments, to organize the new war with revolutionary fighting. It is our duty to blacklist all those leaders of the workers movement who 'consider' the outbreak of a new war as a «fancy», who lull the workers into sleep with pacifist lies, who close their eyes before the preparations for a new war on the part of the bourgeoisie, because these people want that the war may take the workers unawares» (J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 9, pp. 318 & 319 Albanian edition).

Such is J. V. Stalin's stand of principle towards imperialism. And not only in theory. During all his period of practical activity as leader of the Communist Party and of the Soviet State J. V. Stalin has always maintained a firm revolutionary and at the same time an elastic attitude towards imperialism: on one hand he has shown himself vigilant and undaunted dealing a death blow at the opportune moment; on the other, he has succeeded in taking advantage of the contradictions within the camp of the imperialists in order to weaken their power and to enhance the positions of socialism.

The years of the second world war, the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, give

us a brilliant example of Stalin's wise and revolutionary policy. The accusations by N. Khrushchev and his group that Stalin had allegedly under-estimated the danger of fascist aggression and for that reason had incurred colossal losses to the Soviet Army, that Stalin had allegedly maintained a «timid and capitulating» attitude and that he had allegedly been willing to admit defeat and so on and so forth, are sheer, commonplace calumnies. Through these vile slanders and reproaches he repudiates not only Stalin's great historic merits as a strategist and great leader of the Patriotic War, who led it to the brilliant victory of historical importance over the fascists but also belittles the heroic war of the soviet people themselves who seem to have allegedly fought under the leadership of a «dupe», «idiot» and «ignoramus», he makes fun of the blood shed by millions of Soviet people, who seem to have laid down their lives allegedly in the name of a «coward», «defeatist» and «capitulant». But if Stalin has really been what N. Khrushchev describes him, how did it ever come about that the Soviet Union withstood the hardest test in its history, routed the fascist hordes and hoisted the triumphant red flag on the German Reichstag? And what is more ridiculous, in their attempts to blacken Stalin's figure, N. Khrushchev's group and their followers are trying to hold Khrushchev forth as «the most outstanding inspirer and strategist of the Great Patriotic War» and things like that.

In N. Khrushchev's 70th birthday greeting his followers in the leadership of the Party and

of the State wrote among others that during the hard years of the Great Patriotic War N. Khrushchev led in person and on various fronts the self-sacrificing fight of the Soviet soldiers against the Hitlerite invaders, taking very active part in drawing up plans and carrying out the principal military operations in the historic battles of Stalingrad, Kursk, Oryol and elsewhere. When people hear of the homage paid today to N. Khrushchev as a military strategist, they are justified to pose the question: how is it possible that the name of this «so remarkable leader and strategist» has not been heard of during the war and why has this «silent hero» kept his mouth shut all these years only to make an ear-splitting noise of his «historical merits» today?

Let us give another typical example to show how far the moral degeneration of the revisionists goes. In February this year, Radio - Moscow reports, what Marshal Chuykov wrote, in the periodical «Ogonyok»: «I have not felt Stalin's influence in this battle (the Battle of Stalingrad — editors) but, I have often come in touch with Nikita Sergyevich. I pledged my word to him that we would not abandon the city. Some persons say that in my book «At the Outset» I write a great deal about Khrushchev and next to nothing about Stalin. Yes, this is so! I have written only what is true without any exaggeration. I have written what is real.» Whereas in an article appearing in «Pravda» on February 2, 1953 this same Marshal Chuykov wrote: «In accordance with the strategic plan and under the

personal leadership of the ingenious strategist, Generalissimo of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin, the enemy troops besieged at Stalingrad were finally rounded up and liquidated on February 2, 1943. The gigantic battle unparalleled in world history is the triumph of the Stalinian military science, the triumph of the strategic art of our leader and Commander-in-Chief Comrade Stalin who was keen to detect the aims of the enemy and to take advantage of the weakness of their adventuresome strategy. Comrade Stalin elaborated his ingenious strategic plan to smash the German fascist troops at Stalingrad. The kernel of this plan was to offer active resistance in order to exhaust the enemy, to smash his live forces and technique and then to launch a decisive counter attack which would lead to a rounding up and liquidation of the enemy troops». Allow us to ask Marshal Chyukov: When have you told the truth and when have you lied grossly falsifying the historic reality that you have yourself lived through, in the newspaper «Pravda» in 1943 or in the periodical «Ogonyok» in 1964, after having been enrolled into the service of renegate Khrushchev?

The mud the revisionists hurl on Stalin smears their own features. History proves that J. V. Stalin showed himself to be not only an undaunted fighter against imperialism but a wise and farsighted proletarian politician as well. It is a world known historical fact that taking advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves, the Soviet Union, with Stalin at the head, not only hampered the

creation of a united imperialist front but even collaborated with the USA and Britain in order to crush the most aggressive forces of world imperialism at that time — Hitlerite Germany and Japanese militarism.

After the Second World War as well, J. V. Stalin educated the party and the Soviet people and all the revolutionaries not to be intimidated by imperialist blackmail, but to stand unbent and to fight with unflinching confidence in the inevitable triumph over capitalism. When the American imperialists taking advantage of their monopoly of the secret of the atomic weapon practiced their policy of blackmail and «from the positions of force» in order to frighten the Soviet Union, the countries of the people's democracy and all peace-loving peoples, J. V. Stalin stated: «I do not consider the atomic bomb so serious a force as some political leaders are inclined to consider it. The atomic bombs are reckoned to frighten those with weak nerves, but they cannot decide the fate of war, for bombs, for this are quite insufficient» (the periodical «Bolshevik», Nr. 17, 1946). Steadfast resistance to the imperialist pressures and blackmail was considered by J. V. Stalin as an important condition for victory over imperialism, for the triumph of the cause of socialism, of the freedom of peoples and of peace.

J. V. Stalin taught at the same time that in order to safeguard the achievements of socialism and of peace in the world it is essential to keep on strengthening the defensive power of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries and

firmly oppose imperialist aggression. It is a fact that under Stalin's leadership the defensive power of the Soviet Union was greatly enhanced. The Soviet Union was equipped with powerful nuclear weapons and won unrivaled superiority over the western powers in this field. During Stalin's time the basis was laid for further achievements in Soviet science and technique in the field of rockets and other modern weapons. As a true revolutionary and internationalist Stalin has granted major all round aid to the new socialist countries in order to raise, strengthen and modernize their armed forces. The Red Army protected these countries from the danger of imperialist aggression and was an important factor in paralyzing the counter-revolutionary acts of the disowned classes against the people's democratic order.

Side by side with his unflinching revolutionary policy towards imperialism, side by side with his exposure of imperialism's reactionary, aggressive and warmongering nature, J. V. Stalin, leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet State, has consistently pursued a policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. For nearly three decades he has been the promoter of the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Repudiating the calumny of the imperialist bourgeoisie claiming that the socialist state is opposed to peaceful coexistence, J. V. Stalin stressed: «the basis of our relations with capitalist countries is the principle of peaceful coexistence between two opposing systems. Our policy has fully corroborated this,» Stalin said as early as at the

15th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. On many subsequent occasions he has confirmed this idea. Thus in reply to the open letter by Williams in 1948 he again pointed out: «The Government of the USSR is of the opinion that, inspite of differences in economy and ideology, the coexistence of these two systems, the peaceful settlement of the divergences between the USSR and the USA are not only possible but inevitably essential as well as to the interest of general peace». In a reply to a group of American editors on April 2,1952, Stalin re-emphasized: «Peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism is very much possible if there is a mutual desire for collaboration, a willingness to fulfill the obligations contracted, respect for the principle of parity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states».

This consistent peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, fostered and led by J. V. Stalin, has found its concrete expression in numerous documents, steps, proposals and concrete acts of the Soviet Government with which the whole world is familiar.

As a great fighter for peace, J. V. Stalin was fully convinced that the world war could be forestalled, that the united efforts of peoples could evade war, could stop the imperialists from carrying out their bloody plans. «Peace will be preserved and strengthened,» J.V.Stalin stressed in an interview granted to the correspondent of «Pravda» in February 1951, «if the peoples will take the question of safeguarding peace

into their own hands and will defend it to the last. War can become inevitable if the warmongers will succeed in misleading the popular masses, in deceiving and drawing them into a new world war. Therefore the broad campaign in defense of peace, as an instrument of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers assumes primary importance».

Such is J. V. Stalin's revolutionary marxist-leninist line. It is precisely against this correct line that N. Khrushchev's group of renegates have risen. But what is the stand of N. Khrushchev's group themselves towards such important issues? What kind of policy do they practice under the guise of their fight against «the cult of the individual»?

N. Khrushchev's group have not only given up firmly and systematically exposing the imperialists but have long embarked on the road to spreading dangerous illusions about the American imperialists and their leaders, thus lulling to sleep the vigilance of peoples and trying to keep them from fighting imperialism. Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and other leaders of the imperialists are proclaimed by N. Khrushchev as «wise», «realistic» and «peace-loving». Thus, in a speech at the Borshoda Chemical Works in Hungary, during his last April's visit there, N. Khrushchev again exalted «the sense of realism», «the spirit of sound reason» which, allegedly, prevails among the American leaders. «They have accused me» N. Khrushchev boasted, «because I praised Kennedy's speech (of June, 1963 — editors) which contained very realistic judg-

ments» and, persisting in his proimperialist stand, he stressed that «realistic arguments in defense of peace» have also been expressed by D. Rusk, President Johnson and Senator Fullbright». N. Khrushchev is quoted to have said that the imperialists have already given up aggression against the socialist countries and that they have taken his call for peaceful competition to heart and so on. It thus turns out that the imperialists have seemingly changed their aggressive, plundering and reactionary nature.

N. Khrushchev and his supporters uphold the view that, under conditions of the existence of nuclear weapons of mass extermination, the basic contradictions of our epoch become less acute and lose their primary importance, that all peoples, classes and states are allegedly linked by the common basic interest of evading a nuclear war of extermination, of safeguarding peace and peaceful coexistence. They have more than once declared that «the atomic bomb is ignorant of the class principle but kills workers and capitalists alike». This is in fact, to preach the affinity and reconciliation of classes, the workers and the bourgeois exploiters, the oppressed peoples and the imperialist colonizers, to preach the renunciation of fighting the imperialists allegedly in the name of «peace». This is also clearly seen in N. Khrushchev's speech to the Congress of the German United Socialist Party on January 16, 1963 in which he stated: «No problem of the revolutionary movement of the working class and of the national-liberation movement can now be taken up without due regard

to the struggle for peace, to the evasion of the nuclear war». This actually means that under conditions of the existence of nuclear weapons, the working class should give up the revolution, the oppressed peoples should give up their national-liberation war, while the socialist countries should give up exposing the imperialists and opposing imperialist aggression, they should give up aiding the revolutionary wars of peoples. In other words, all the revolutionary forces should be checked, they should give up doing anything that might irritate the American imperialists lest they launch a nuclear war.

But day to day experience gives the lie to the opportunist preachings of the revisionists on «reconciling» the contradictions and shows to the people that the only right way to liberation and preservation of peace is the way of fighting the imperialists. As a matter of fact the capitalist world is being gnawed at by deep contradictions, it seethes with people's wars against the imperialists with the Americans in the lead. The imperialists themselves are obliged to admit it publicly. This is what one of the American high officials Chester Bowls, has to say about it: «Every time I turn my eyes to this globe a problem rises in my head. In the past there were only three or four countries that caused us trouble whereas now there are tens of them. This globe causes a real headache to me». Whereas the periodical «The United States News and World Report» admits in an article under the title: «The star of the United States is setting» that: «It is obvious that the influence of Ame-

rica is waning throughout the world. Tiny Cuba or Panama are not afraid of all this power of the United States; tiny Ghana too pursues an anti-American line; The Congo has again become a dangerous region». The earth is burning under the feet of the imperialists wherever they tread. «In South Vietnam», the «Chicago Tribune» writes, «they throw hand granates on American officers. In Cyprus a bomb explodes at the American Embassy. In Ghana the American flag is trampled upon by crowds who condemn American imperialism».

N. Khrushchev's anti-revolutionary line is dictated by his shameful capitulation before the atomic blackmail of the imperialists. It is not at all casual that the Soviet leaders with N. Khrushchev at the head have become the most zealous propagandists of the nuclear intimidations of the imperialists in order to frighten people and to wean them away from the resolute revolutionary war against the imperialists. Marshal A. Jeremenko of the USSR speaks very clearly of this in a statement published in the Bulgarian newspaper «Rabotnichesko Dello»; «As a matter of fact, the war at present, as far as its consequences are concerned, may be compared with the most terrible catastrophy like, say, a sheet of ice covering the whole surface of the earth, or like the earth crushing with the other big planets of the sky».

Succumbing from head to foot to the atomic blackmail of the American imperialists and

crossing over as a result of this to positions of bourgeois nationalism, N. Khrushchev's group have assigned to themselves the task of improving relations with the USA, of getting closer to and collaborating with them, as their highest ideal even if this implies sacrificing and trampling upon the vital interests of the socialist countries, of the revolutionary movement of oppressed peoples. This is borne out by the practical activity of N. Khrushchev's treacherous group in the international arena. They strive to disarm the People's Republic of Albania and take under their protection the traitors to the Albanian people and agents of imperialism at a time when they, together with the Titoite clique, the Greek monarchic fascists and their masters, the American imperialists, tried to carry out their great plot to overthrow the people's regime in Albania. They do not only side with the Indian reactionaries in the Sino-Indian border dispute but, in unison with the American and English imperialists provide them with supersonic airplanes, weapons and other equipment for aggressive action against the People's Republic of China. They did not hesitate to withdraw from Cuba the rockets they had sent there allegedly to protect Cuba from aggression by the American imperialists, when Kennedy threatened them. N. Khrushchev concluded the Soviet-American-English Treaty on the partial banning of nuclear weapons, which is a great deception and a grave threat to peace, and he is now doing his best to come to terms with the American imperial-

ists about the so-called ban on spreading nuclear weapons, measures these that aim at establishing the monopoly of the USA and of N. Khrushchev's group on these weapons, a major betrayal jeopardizing the defensive power of the socialist countries and making it even possible for the USA to win superiority over the Soviet Union itself in nuclear armaments.

Following the signing of the ill-famed Moscow treaty N. Khrushchev's group took further steps aiming at disguising the policy of aggression and war of the American imperialists, at creating illusions and deceiving peoples. Such are the aims pursued by the Soviet-American agreement «to reduce production of fissile material» as well as by the proposal of the so-called renunciation of the use of force in settling land and boundary disputes in which N. Khrushchev not unintentionally, makes no distinction between imperialist aggression and land and border disputes left over by history.

But by trampling under foot the vital interests of the fraternal socialist countries, by putting the brakes on the anti-imperialist struggle of peoples for the sake of getting closer to the American imperialists, N. Khrushchev's group injure and jeopardize the interests of the Soviet Union itself. Inspite of the treacherous line of capitulation to and affiliation with the enemy of the class persistently pursued by N. Khrushchev's group, the deep contradictions between the Soviet Union, as a socialist country, and imperialism remain. The imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, continue to be

the sworn enemies of the Soviet people, for they have never stopped nor will ever stop their aggressive and undermining acts to subjugate the Soviet Union. Therefore, by linking up with the imperialists against the true allies of the Soviet Union — the socialist countries and the revolutionary and national-liberation movement — N. Khrushchev weakens the position of the Soviet Union and exposes the Soviet people to serious risks.

It is appropriate to refer here to some important teachings of J.V. Stalin. In a speech delivered at the «Sverdlov» University on June 9, 1925 touching on the danger of losing sight of the international revolutionary perspective and slipping as a consequence to nationalism, Stalin said:

«The characteristic feature of this danger is mistrust in the international proletarian revolution; lack of confidence in its success; sceptic attitude towards the national liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries; ignoring the fact that without backing up the revolutionary movement of other countries our own country would not have been able to face world imperialism; ignoring the fact that the success of socialism in one country alone cannot be definitive, for this country cannot be guaranteed from intervention so long as the revolution has not won in at least a number of countries; ignorance of the elementary requirement of internationalism according to which the triumph of socialism in one single country is not

an end in itself but a means to develop and support the revolution in other countries.

This is the way of nationalism and of degeneration, the way of complete liquidation of the internationalist policy of the proletariat, because the persons inflicted with this disease do not view our country as part of a whole, which is called the world revolutionary movement, but as a beginning and an end of this movement thinking that for the sake of our own country the interests of all other countries may be sacrificed.

Should we support the liberation movement in China? And why? Would this not be risky? Does this not put us on bad terms with other countries? Would it not have been better for us too to establish «spheres of influence» in China together with the other «advanced» countries and wrest something from China to our benefit? This is both profitable and harmless... Should we support the liberation movement in Germany? Is it profitable to take the risk? Would it not have been better to come to terms with the Entente regarding the Versaille Treaty and wrest something in the form of remuneration? Should we guard our friendship with Persia, Turkey and Afganistan? Is it worth while? Would it not have been better to establish 'spheres of influence' with any of the Great Powers? and so on and so forth.

Such are the nationalist «trends» of the new type which strive to liquidate the foreign policy of the October Revolution and which the elements of degeneration cultivate.

If the first source of danger, of the danger of liquidation lies in the strengthening of the bourgeois influence in the party, in the field of internal policy, in the field of the conflict of capitalist and social elements in our national economy, then, the strengthening of the bourgeois influence in the party in the field of foreign policy, in the field of the war of the capitalist states against the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, should be considered as the second source of danger, of the danger of nationalism. It cannot be doubted that the pressure of the capitalist states on our state is immense, that the functionaries of our foreign policy cannot always resist this pressure and that the danger of complications often inveigle them to take the road of minimal resistance, the road of nationalism.

On the other hand, it is clear that it is only on the basis of consistent internationalism, only on the basis of the foreign policy of the October Revolution that the first triumphant country can hold in its hand the role of the flag bearer of the world revolutionary movement, that the way of minimal resistance and of nationalism in foreign policy is the way to isolation and to ruin of the first triumphant country.

This is why the loss of perspective of the international revolution leads to the danger of nationalism and of degeneration». (J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, pp 169—171 inc. Albanian edition).

These valuable, farsighted teachings of J.V. Stalin are of actual major importance in unmasking the treacherous features of N. Khrush-

chev's group, who have succumbed from head to foot before the pressure of the imperialists and have plunged deep into the mire of nationalism and chauvinism, causing immeasurable damage to the vital interests of the Soviet Union itself, of the socialist camp and of all the revolutionary movement in the world.

Contrary to J.V. Stalin's marxist-leninist line, stressing that the communist parties «should take advantage of the contradictions in the bourgeois camp, so that its forces may be weakened and crushed, so that the positions of the proletariat may be strengthened» (J.V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, page 57, Albanian edition) N. Khrushchev's group assist the imperialists. Instead of striving to isolate the principal enemy — American imperialism — which is rightfully proclaimed in the 1960 Moscow Declaration as the main bastion of world reaction and international gendarm, the enemy of all the peoples of the world, N. Khrushchev's group do their utmost in the international arena to come to the aid of the American imperialists to subjugate and keep under control their partners, to safeguard their «unity» and keep sway over the NATO aggressive block, which has received cracks because of the bitter contradictions arisen there, because of the attempts of the European powers to get rid of the dictates of the USA. The so-called «elastic policy» of N. Khrushchev's group is nothing but a demagogical maneuver in the service of the American imperialists.

The anti-marxist, capitulating and reconciliatory stand of N. Khrushchev's group towards

the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, the pacifist illusions which they spread about the leaders of imperialism, their «compromises with the American imperialists» and so on — all of these seriously jeopardize the cause of peace and increase the danger of war, because, on one hand, they lull to sleep the vigilance of peace-loving peoples and leave free hand to the imperialists to carry on undisturbed their unbridled armament race, to prepare for and launch various aggressive wars, and, on the other hand, they bring about a split in the ranks of the socialist camp and jeopardize the defensive power of the socialist countries and of the camp as a whole, which is main bastion of peace in the world. N. Khrushchev's group consider the wars of peoples as «empty words and trifles» and hold the view that the destiny of peace depends on the talks, «goodwill» and «agreement» between N. Khrushchev and the American President who hold the rockets and nuclear weapons in their hand.

All of these go to show that N. Khrushchev's revisionist group have entirely moved away from marxism-leninism, they have departed from the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations where it is stressed that the ceaseless exposure of the American warmongers and the mobilization of peoples in the active strife to defend peace are a categorical necessity. Thus, the 1960 Moscow Declaration urges: «To fight for peace means to show great vigilance, to keep on exposing the policy of the imperialists, to keep an eye on the intrigues and machinations of the warmongers

to direct the people's sacred resentment against those that pursue a policy of launching wars, means to perfect the organization of the peace-loving forces, to continually increase the active operations of the masses in defense of peace and to strengthen the collaboration with states not interested in new wars».

The anti-marxist, anti-revolutionary and treacherous attitude of N. Khrushchev and his group is clearly seen especially with regard to their ideas on peaceful coexistence. Fully at variance with the leninist conception of peaceful coexistence, which J. V. Stalin has always strictly observed, N. Khrushchev's group and their followers have proclaimed peaceful coexistence as «the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries», even as «the basis of the strategy of communism at the present stage», «the fundamental law governing the whole life of present society», «the only and best way to solve the problems of vital importance that stand before society», «premises of the victory of the revolutionary wars of peoples of various countries», «the most advanced form of the struggle of peoples of various countries against imperialism, of the wars of all oppressed nations for national liberation» and so on and so forth. A conception of this kind on peaceful coexistence means, in fact, renunciation of the class struggle and its replacement with class peace and class collaboration between the exploited and the exploiters, means renunciation of the revolutionary and national-liberation war, means renunciation of proletarian internationalism, renunciation of

active and unreserved support which the socialist countries should give to the revolutionary struggle of the working class in capitalist countries and to the liberation war of the enslaved peoples against the imperialist slave holders.

Ridiculous are the claims of the modern revisionists that N. Khrushchev re-invented, so to speak, and furthered the leninist idea of peaceful coexistence at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In reality he badly distorted Lenin's idea by turning it into a theory and policy fully conformable with the interests of the American imperialists both in compelling the socialist countries not to back the revolutionary, anti-imperialist wars of peoples as well as to give free play to the so-called «peaceful evolution» towards capitalism in the socialist countries which pursue «peaceful coexistence» a la Khrushchev. Peaceful coexistence which N. Khrushchev preaches is nothing else but the quintessence of the Titoite course of integrating socialism into capitalism. This was clearly stated by the renegate of the French working class, Guy Mollet when in a statement to Tanjug on April 19, after his talks with N. Khrushchev he said: «The views boldly expressed in 1948 on many ways towards socialism and on peaceful coexistence have now lost their heretic nature. And the evolution of the Soviet Union, the development of which we were able to discern a few months ago in Moscow bear now out and corroborate the attitude which Comrade Tito and his other collaborators explained to us in a clear and convincing way ten

years ago». It is not casual that the various representatives of imperialism who have become fully aware of the fact that N. Khrushchev's «peaceful coexistence» is in fact the line of getting closer and collaborating with the imperialists, praise N. Khrushchev's revisionist group and try to help and to push them further ahead towards this treacherous line of action.

The marxist-leninist parties, the true revolutionary communists in all countries, unmask and firmly reject the treacherous line of N. Khrushchev and his group, they consider it their internationalist duty to uphold J.V. Stalin's line of foreign policy which meets the vital interests of the working class and of peoples, of the cause of socialism and peace.

N. KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP HAVE REPLACED PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM WITH NATIONALISM AND CHAUVINISM

Within the framework of their anti-Stalinist campaign, N. Khrushchev's group of renegates are again raising a lot of noise about the so-called «chauvinist stand» of Stalin towards fraternal parties and socialist countries. Stalin is accused of allegedly trying to subjugate the other communist parties and socialist countries, that he treated from positions of inequality, forced on others his arbitrary views, line and

decisions, extended the ideological divergences into the field of state relations among socialist states, going even as far as repressions against various leaders of fraternal parties and so on. In this connection the revisionists refer, above all, to his allegedly «chauvinist» stand towards Jugoslavia and the Titoite clique. Such reproaches are also contained in Suslov's report to the 1964 February plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as well as in other writings of N. Khrushchev's group. Thus, in his speech delivered on April 15 this year at a Soviet-Polish rally in Moscow N. Khrushchev said among others. «The cult of the individual exerted a bad influence on the situation of a number of fraternal parties, and especially on the situation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the Polish and Hungarian communists, that after the 20th Congress the relations between socialist states became closer, more friendly and elements of inequality were removed» and so on and so forth.

It is clear to all who are familiar with facts and with the attitude of N. Khrushchev and his group towards socialist countries and fraternal parties, who are familiar with the methods which N. Khrushchev uses in his relations with them, that the above accusations against Stalin revert to N. Khrushchev's group themselves, that he tries to blame the sound mind for the faults of the sick mind.

Our Party has no information on what attitude Stalin has maintained towards other fraternal parties and other socialist countries. It

is not to be excluded that mistakes may have been made, especially since the relations between socialist countries are (in Stalin's time they were even more so) a relatively new phenomenon with limited accumulated experience. But Stalin was a marxist-leninist of principle and when he did make a mistake he openly avowed it and resorted to self-criticism. Anyhow, our Party is aware of certain basic factors, and what is more, has its own historical experience to refer to:

Firstly, regarding the main reproach of N. Khrushchev's group that Stalin has allegedly committed a grave mistake with respect to Jugoslavia, that he has done great injustice to Tito and to his companions and even to the Jugoslav people, this is altogether false. What have historical facts proven? They have proven that Stalin and the Informative Bureau were fully justified in condemning Tito's clique as traitors to marxism-leninism and socialism and dangerous agents of the American imperialists to degenerate socialism, to undermine and split the socialist camp, the internationalist communist and revolutionary movement, the liberation movement and the forces of peace. It was precisely on these grounds the Titoite clique were condemned by the communist and workers parties of the whole world at the 1960 Moscow meeting. The rehabilitation of Tito's clique and full unity with them is a betrayal on the part of N. Khrushchev and his group of renegates.

Secondly, as regards the accusations according to which «the cult of the individual» is

claimed to have caused great damage and difficulties to Poland, Hungary and so on, the stone N. Khrushchev raises against Stalin falls back on his own head. Because every one is aware that it was exactly «in the spirit of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union» and of the so-called «fight against the cult of the individual» that the counter-revolutionary acts were organized in these countries in 1956 by persons like Imre Nagy and C° who were under the protection of N. Khrushchev's group. It is revisionism that has exerted a bad influence in the situation of these parties. It is also a well known fact that N. Khrushchev has brutally interfered in the internal affairs of the Workers Revolutionary Party of Hungary and has plotted jointly with renegate Tito in Brioni to overthrow the leadership of the party in Hungary and place revisionist elements in their places. And who keeps the former leaders of the Hungarian party and of the Greek Communist Party isolated and in banishment? Who incited Barack whom the Soviet leaders considered «their best man in Czechoslovakia»? Or Anibal Escalante, the renegate who strove to undermine the revolutionary leadership in Cuba, for which act he was ousted from Cuba, who has given him shelter? Let N. Khrushchev's group deny or repudiate these facts if they dare.

Thirdly, our party has its experience of the relations with the leadership of the Communist Party and of the Soviet State during Stalin's time. They are a brilliant example of carrying out in practice the principles of proletarian in-

ternationalism in relations between fraternal parties and fraternal socialist countries. J.V. Stalin has always maintained a most fraternal attitude towards our party and our country, has given them a generous internationalist aid, he has always treated our party on the basis of parity and of mutual respect, has never intervened in its internal affairs and has not striven to force its ideas on it. During talks with leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania, when our Party has solicited his ideas and council on this or that matter, he has always insisted that his words were by no means binding on our Party, that they should be viewed with a critical eye, conformable with our concrete conditions and our Party should decide itself according to its own experience and judgment. This is quite contrary to the hostile, brutal and chauvinist attitude of N. Khrushchev and his group towards our Party and our country.

Contrary to the trumped up charges of N. Khrushchev and his revisionist followers, all of J.V. Stalin's views and deeds show that he was a great internationalist revolutionary who has given a notable contribution towards expanding and consolidating the world communist and revolutionary movement, towards setting up and developing the socialist camp.

He used to stress with vigor that, as the first victorious socialist country, the Soviet Union should persistently pursue a revolutionary, internationalist policy so that it may honorably carry out its historic mission as a powerful supporter of the international proletarian revolution

resisting all kinds of threats and blackmail on the part of the imperialists. He used to say:

«One of the two:

we shall either keep on practicing a revolutionary policy, gathering the proletarians and the oppressed around the working class of the USSR — in which case the international capital will use all methods and means to hinder our advance;

or we shall give up our revolutionary policy, we shall make a series of concessions of principle to international capital — in which case, international capital will certainly not refuse «to aid us» in the matter of degenerating our socialist country into a «docile» bourgeois republic». (J.V. Stalin, Works, vol. 11, p. 55 & 56, Albanian edition).

Stalin never considered his revolutionary mission completed only with the triumph of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union alone. The leninist theory of the revolution, he used to say, was not the theory of its triumph in a specific country alone, but at the same time the theory of carrying out the world revolution. Therefore Stalin used to stress «the triumph of socialism in one country alone is not an end in itself. The revolution of that country where it has triumphed should not consider itself an entity in itself but a part, a means to speed up the victory of the proletariat in all countries... as the beginning and preliminary condition of world revolution». (J.V. Stalin, «Problems of Leninism» pp. 113 & 114, Albanian edition).

On the other hand, Stalin used to stress that

the country of victorious socialism should not only aid and support the proletariat and peoples of other countries to speed up and facilitate the triumph of the revolution in these countries, but it also needs the aid and support of the working class and peoples of other countries in order to protect the achievements of socialism and carry them further ahead. «It would be a mistake», Stalin said at the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to think that our party, which has become a great force, has no longer need of support. This is not true. Our Party and our country have always stood and will always stand in need of the confidence, sympathy and support of the fraternal peoples of other countries... It goes without saying that our Party cannot fail to reward the fraternal parties, it should also, on its part, support them as well as their peoples, in their fight for liberation, in their fight to safeguard peace».

The give and take of aid and support is a duty and necessity for all socialist countries, it is a living expression of proletarian internationalism. Stalin has strictly observed and put into practice these correct internationalist principles throughout his lifetime. These teachings of J.V. Stalin are of great actual importance today when they have been trampled upon by the modern revisionists who have abandoned the principles of proletarian internationalism and have precipitated into the positions of the chauvinism of the big state.

Loyal to the end to his revolutionary duty, J.V. Stalin, as a notable leader of the interna-

tional revolutionary communist movement, has rendered valuable contribution towards its growth and development. He has been one of the most outstanding and authoritative personalities of the 3d Communist International. Following Lenin's death he held aloft the banner of leninism in the Communist International and rendered a major contribution towards bolshevizing the communist and workers parties, towards training revolutionary cadres, towards elaborating a correct strategy and tactics of the international communist and workers movement. If in October 1917 there was only one communist party of the new type with a membership of 400 thousand, in 1928 the number of parties increased to 46 while that of communists increased to 1 million 860 thousand, in 1935 the number of parties rose to 61, while that of communists to 3 million 141 thousand, whereas after the Second World War there were about 70 parties with over 30 million members.

During and after the Second World War the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Stalin, aided the peoples and communist parties in their liberation war against the fascists and in consolidating the achievements attained by them in this war. Being at the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet State, Stalin has rendered a major contribution towards setting up and consolidating the world socialist system and towards establishing correct fraternal relations between socialist countries, based on the principles of marxism-leninism and of proletarian internationalism.

All the time that Stalin stood at the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet State the socialist camp and the international communist movement were a single entity fully linked in thought and deeds, in a correct revolutionary line. Now it is becoming ever so clear for all that the rift in the socialist camp and in the international communist movement began exactly when N. Khrushchev's group rose against Stalin, when, contrary to the line pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union during Stalin's time, they began to pursue their revisionist line and to violate the norms and principles governing the relations between socialist countries and communist parties.

As a revolutionary internationalist and loyal disciple of the great Lenin, J.V. Stalin has always given effective and unreserved support to the anti-imperialist national liberation war of enslaved peoples. Condemning the traitorous leaders of the 2nd International who feigned to uphold the legitimate rights of the oppressed peoples only by word and formal declarations but in fact sided with the imperialist oppressors, Stalin wrote: «Leninism has brought the national question down from the peaks of pompous declarations to the earth, maintaining that statements on the «parity of nations» not backed by direct support on the part of proletarian parties for the liberation war of the oppressed peoples are sheer bombast and misleading. Thus the question of oppressed peoples becomes one of support and aid, effective and continuous aid to oppressed nations in their fight against im-

perialism for effective equality of nations, for their existence as independent states». (Stalin, Works, vol. 6, pp 143 & 144, Albanian edition).

Like Lenin, J.V. Stalin considered the national-liberation war of enslaved peoples as a powerful force undermining the imperialist system and as the great ally of the world proletarian revolution. «The colonial countries» Stalin used to stress, «are the main rearguard of the imperialists. Revolutionizing these rearguards cannot fail to undermine imperialism not only in the sense that imperialism will have no rearguard but also in the sense that the revolutionization of the East should give a decisive impetus to the revolutionary movement in the West» (J.V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, page 231, Albanian edition). Hence, he stressed, «it becomes essential for the proletariat of the «ruling» nations to give active support to the national-liberation movement of oppressed and dependent peoples» (J.V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 145, Albanian edition).

Stalin attached great importance to the ties, the alliance of the revolutionary movement of the working class of the advanced countries and the national revolutionary movement of the oppressed and dependent countries. He viewed these two movements as the two main forces in the struggle to crush imperialism. He used to stress that: «The interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies require the union of these two forms of the revolutionary movement in a common front against the com-

mon enemy, against the imperialists» because «the triumph of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of peoples writhing under the yoke of the imperialists cannot be realized without the creation and consolidation of the common revolutionary front». (J. V. Stalin, «Problems of Leninism» page 59, Albanian edition).

The slanders and trumped up charges of N. Khrushchev's group and their followers are not able to bedim, however slightly, the distinguished personality of J.V. Stalin as a great internationalist revolutionary. But what line does N. Khrushchev pursue, under the guise of the «fight against the cult of the individual» with regard to the problems of relations between fraternal parties and socialist countries? What attitude does he maintain towards the revolutionary and national-liberation movement? All his line is characterized by the replacement of proletarian internationalism with nationalism and chauvinism of the big state. Let us refer to facts:

1. — Under the pretext that at present the ways of «peaceful transition» to socialism are allegedly increasing in many countries of the world and interpreting this peaceful transition in an entirely oppportunist way as a gain of the majority in the bourgeois parliament without the need of breaking up the bourgeois state machinery and replacing it with the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, even intimidating peoples that the non-peaceful way of transition to socialism may allegedly lead to the outbreak of armed conflicts among states even to a world

nuclear war, N. Khrushchev's group and their followers deny in fact the revolution; they have given up supporting the revolutionary movement in other countries. Succumbing to the atomic blackmail of the American imperialists and striving by all means for «peaceful coexistence» and «all round collaboration» with «the wealthy» and «powerful» imperialist countries N. Khrushchev's group do not hesitate to sacrifice the interests of the workers of other countries and have taken over the task of checking the revolutionary war. For this service to them they have won the sympathy and gratitude of the imperialists, particularly of the American imperialists, and has thus «purchased» their «pledge» for a 20-year long period of peace and for benefits derived from the «advantages» of collaboration with the USA and the other Western powers. This is bourgeois nationalism pure and simple.

2. — By persistently spreading illusions that colonialism has allegedly been entirely, or almost entirely eliminated at present, that the liberation of oppressed peoples may allegedly be achieved through «peaceful coexistence» and complete and general disarmament, that colonialism may allegedly be eliminated through the United Nations Organization, that the imperialist powers would even help a great deal the economically backward regions of the world to progress, intimidating people that «any spark might set the world aflame» — through all this N. Khrushchev's group try to check and quell the anti-imperialist national-liberation war of enslaved

peoples, they have given up aiding this war. And through these services, which meet in full the objectives of the basic strategy of the imperialists, N. Khrushchev's group of renegates hope to attain «peaceful coexistence» and collaboration with the imperialists.

N. Khrushchev's and his followers' attempts to persuade people that they are allegedly guided by «humane» considerations, that they are allegedly eager to spare the working class and peoples «unnecessary» bloodshed and sacrifices, and the world «atomic catastrophy», cannot cover up the fact that the Khrushchevian revisionists have plunged deep into the mire of nationalism, that for the sake of their narrow interests they unscrupulously trample under foot the vital interests of peoples.

3. — N. Khrushchev's group have more than once accused the marxist-leninist parties for sticking to the line of building socialism relying on their own efforts and resources and of developing their economy independently. The revisionists have proclaimed this as a line of «narrow nationalism» of «self-isolation» and so on. In his speech at Mishkolz in Hungary at the beginning of April N. Khrushchev even declared: «Only fools can suppose that the edification of socialism is possible without the support and resources of the fraternal community of peoples who have chosen the road to socialism». But how was socialism built in the USSR when the socialist community was not yet in existence? Was it with the aid and credits of the imperialists? Of course, now that the world socialist system,

the socialist camp, exists, mutual fraternal aid on the principles of equality and independence of every socialist country, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of one another, are an important factor that facilitates the building of socialism in each country and speeds up the process. Whereas N. Khrushchev's group violate these very same principles and try to subjugate the other socialist countries economically under the pretext of «the international division of labor» and of «specialization».

Taking advantage of the fact that the Soviet Union is the most powerful socialist state from the economic point of view, N. Khrushchev's group force upon socialist countries, through the Economic Committee of Mutual Assistance and other forms, such measures as to prejudice their economic independence and their state sovereignty, like, say, drawing a joint plan and setting up a single organ of planning for all the members of the Economic Committee of Mutual Assistance, uniting the different technical branches of production among states, the setting up of enterprises with joint ownership of a number of states, the setting up of economic blocks among states, and so on. Through forms of this kind N. Khrushchev's group intend to wrest the most important branches of economy from national management and turn them over to «supergovernmental» organs, in other words, to set up a «government over the governments» of other socialist countries, a thing which is prejudicial to their independence. Our people are well aware of what these «measures» are, for they have had

a taste of them since prior to 1948, when Tito's renegate clique attempted to set up a so-called «mixed Albanian-Jugoslav Committee», a second government over the Government of the People's Republic of Albania. Measures of this kind are expressions of the pure chauvinism of the big state, into which N. Khrushchev's group have plunged heels over head, essentially they bear no difference to the forms of «economic integration» in capitalism like, for instance, «The European Common Market» in which the big imperialist powers subdue their weaker partners.

Under the pretext of «specialization» N. Khrushchev's group have striven and continue to strive to turn the economy of certain socialist countries into an appendage of the economy of the Soviet Union for producing agricultural products or raw materials. They therefore hinder by all methods and means the development of industry, especially its principal branches, in these countries. Wasn't it Khrushchev, who, during his visit to Albania in 1959, suggested to our party and government, under the demagogical slogan that he wished to see Albania become a «flourishing garden», that we «specialize» in raising only oranges and fruits, without worrying about grains which the Soviet Union will provide Albania with in abundance? It took less than over a year to see clearly what N. Khrushchev was driving at with his «advice» when, with the purpose of forcing our Party to its knees following the infamous Bucharest Meeting, he tried to «tighten the belt» of our people by refusing to sell them wheat and let them thus suffer from hunger. But even in this N. Khrush-

chev cannot claim distinction for originality, for in fact he repeated the same «advice» Tito's clique used to give to our Party to «specialize» the entire economy of the country in raising sunflower. On this occasion too, we have to do with the purest chauvinism of N. Khrushchev's group who are faithfully following in the tracks of their «master» — renegate Tito.

As to turning Albania into a flourishing garden, our people are deeply convinced that socialist Albania will certainly become a flourishing garden, proceeding along the path of independent economic development, relying first and foremost on the efforts of its own people as well as on the truly internationalist aid of the fraternal socialist countries, like the aid which the USSR under the leadership of Stalin used to give it before and the aid which the great People's Republic of China gives it today.

4. — N. Khrushchev's group have brutally violated and violate the norms and principles governing relations between fraternal communist and workers parties clearly defined in the 1960 Moscow Declarations — the principles of parity, independence, mutual respect and comradely consultations. Is it not Khrushchev that has striven to force his revisionist and treacherous line on all the fraternal parties and to make the decisions of one party, as for instance, the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, or the arbitrary condemnation of Stalin, binding on all fraternal parties? Is it not Khrushchev that, since the Bucharest meeting in June 1960, but more particularly after the Moscow meeting in

November, 1960, laid the strictest economic and political blockade on our party and country only and only because the Party of Labor of Albania refused to be hitched to his revisionist cart?

The chauvinist, hostile and brutal attitude of N. Khrushchev's group towards our party and our country is a truly unmasking indictment against this band of renegates. That is why they strive by all means to deny the fact and throw the blame for the deterioration of the Soviet-Albanian relations to the Party of Labor of Albania. Thus, in Suslov's report to the 1964 February plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union it is said that the Government of the People's Republic of Albania «put an end to the political, economic and military collaboration with the Soviet Union and with the majority of the other socialist countries». This is a far from clever and ridiculous calumny. Was it the Albanians who cut all credits to the Soviet Union, who withdrew the specialists and expelled the Soviet students from Albania? Was it Albania that laid the economic and political blockade around the Soviet Union? Was it the Albanians who withdrew their submarines from the Soviet Union? It is hard to find normal people to lend credit to «miracles» of this kind. On the contrary, the whole world is aware that it was N. Khrushchev's group who extended their ideological differences with the Party of Labor of Albania into the field of state relations, who tried to set up a strict blockade around the People's Republic of Albania, quite similar to that of the Ameri-

can imperialists against socialist Cuba, and who went so far as to rupture diplomatic relations with a socialist country.

N. Khrushchev's group has maintained and maintains similar chauvinist and hostile attitudes against the Communist Party and the People's Republic of China as well as towards other marxist-leninist parties and certain other socialist countries.

5. Through their antimarxist views and anti-internationalist acts, N. Khrushchev and his group become the most dangerous splitters of the socialist camp, of the international communist movement and of the international democratic movement and organizations. By revising the basic teachings of marxism-leninism they have undermined the very basis for a sound unity of the international communist movement. At the same time they have unscrupously violated and continue to violate the joint decisions of the communist and workers parties — the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations — they have brutally violated and continue to violate the marxist-leninist norms governing the relations between sister parties and fraternal socialist countries replacing proletarian internationalism with the chauvinism of the big state, equality and independence with intervention and subjugation. collaboration and fraternal aid with pressures, blockades and rupture of relations with fraternal countries, comradely consultations with public attacks and calumnies, excommunications and hostile undermining acts against fraternal parties.

In line with their splitting and undermining

acts the Khrushchevian revisionists have recently launched a new crusade against the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labor of Albania and other marxist-leninist parties directed towards a full and open rift in the communist movement and the socialist camp which is being carried out also under the guise of the fight against «the cult of the individual and its consequences».

But it is becoming more evident from day to day that the line of anti-Stalinism is the line of betrayal of proletarian internationalism, the line of national egotism and of the chauvinism of the big state, the line of splitting the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, the line of betrayal of the interests of the world revolutionary movement.

THE PROBLEM OF THE STAND TOWARDS STALIN — A GREAT PROBLEM OF PRINCIPLE FOR THE WHOLE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT.

Such are the true objectives behind the earsplitting noise of N. Khrushchev and his group of traitors on the so-called problem of «Stalin's cult of the individual». With this in view, the Party of Labor of Albania together with the other fraternal marxist-leninist parties throughout the world, have risen in defense of J. V. Stalin of his work and of his views. They proceed from the fact that the problem of the attitude towards Stalin, of assessing his views and his work, is not a problem of sympathy or antipathy towards this or the other per-

son, nor is it only an internal problem of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union alone. It is a major problem of principle of vital importance for the whole international communist and workers movement.

1. — The Stalin question is a great actual problem and of world significance because J. V. Stalin did not uphold or elaborate any other doctrine differing from that of Marx, Engels and Lenin. As a matter of fact, what N. Khrushchev and his followers disdainfully call «Stalinism» which they try to belittle and discard by all methods and means, is nothing else but marxism-leninism defended by Stalin at daggers drawn from very divers opportunist and revisionist trends, ranging from the anarchists and bourgeois nationalists to Bukharin, Trotzky and Tito, and further developed by Stalin under the concrete conditions of socialist and communist edification in the Soviet Union and of further development of the workers, revolutionary and anti-imperialist movement throughout the world. Attacks against Stalin, against his ideas and work are attempts to replace marxism-leninism with revisionism in theory and in practice. Therefore, the campaign about the Stalin question which is being waged between the marxist-leninists and the modern revisionists is in reality a campaign for the true question of principle: should the basic principles and teachings of marxism-leninism which J. V. Stalin so masterfully and courageously defended, carried out and developed, be further observed by the working class and the international communist movement, or should they be discarded and replaced

by the opportunist ideas of Bernstein, Kautzky, Trotzky, Bukharin, the right-wing socialist. Tito and other renegates which Stalin opposed and which N. Khrushchev tries to force on all fraternal parties under the guise of «creative development» of marxism?

2. — J. V. Stalin headed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Socialist State for nearly thirty years at a stretch. During this period, the Soviet Union, led by Stalin, carried out the great historical leap — it built socialist society, it was transformed into a powerful socialist state with an up-to-date industry, with an advanced kholkhosian agriculture, with a high level education, culture, science and technique, with a powerful defensive capacity which, during the years of the Second World War, crushed the colossal military machinery of Hitlerite Germany, and the soviet people set to work to build communist society. During Stalin's period of leadership socialism attained other achievements of world historical significance: it emerged from the framework of a single state and it became a world system, the powerful socialist camp came to being and the socialist countries, following in the tracks of the Soviet Union attained important and all round success in building socialism with the generous internationalist aid of the Soviet Union headed by J. V. Stalin. Slandering against Stalin, calling all the period of his leadership a period «of the reign of terror», of grave «violations of socialist justice» and so on, the revisionists try to belittle, to falsify and to discard the historical experience of the dicta-

torship of the proletariat and of the building of socialism and communism in the Soviet Union during the period of Stalin's leadership. Therefore the campaign about Stalin's question which is being waged between the marxist-leninists and modern revisionists is in fact a campaign about a vital problem of principle: should the basic historical experience of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the way pointed out by Lenin and Stalin, be faithfully pursued in the days to come, or should the peoples who fight for the triumph of socialism and communism embark on another road, on the road to betrayal and to degeneration of socialism, on the road to the restoration of capitalism to which N. Khrushchev and his group try to draw them?

3. — The problem of J. V. Stalin is a major problem of principle of world significance also because J. V. Stalin has been, at the head of the international communist and workers movement for tens of years in succession. Carrying out Lenin's teachings and under the guidance of Stalin the world communist and workers movement expanded during this period, marxist-leninist parties sprang up in many countries, many parties were bolshevized, they played a decisive role in the war against fascism, for the triumph of the popular revolutions, many marxist-leninist cadres were trained, a solid marxist-leninist unity of the whole world communist movement was achieved during this period. The campaign against the Stalin problem which is being waged between the marxist-leninists and the modern revisionists is in

fact a campaign for the major problem of principle: should we proceed along Lenin's and Stalin's path in the days to come, along the path of developing and expanding the revolutionary movement against the bourgeoisie and the imperialists in the motherland and colonies, along the road of unbreakable unity of the international communist and workers movement and the world camp of socialism on the basis of the principles of marxism-leninism and of the proletarian internationalism, or should we give up this historical experience and the communist and workers parties embark on the road to national isolation or to the chauvinism of the big state, on the road to dissension, to degeneration and to capitulation before the imperialists and the bourgeois ideology?

4. — By making much of the so-called war against «Stalin's cult of the individual», by enhancing it in an artificial way, N. Khrushchev's group openly violated the leninist doctrine on the relations between the masses, the classes, the party and the leadership, set the masses against the leadership, centralization against democracy, used this method to threaten and subjugate all those who refused to comply with his dictates, to attack and remove all the revolutionary cadres and leaders faithful to marxism-leninism in his country and in the fraternal parties, to brutally interfere in their internal affairs. Therefore, exposing the Khrushchevian bluff on the so-called «fight against Stalin's cult of the individual» has nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged controversy, as if one upholds the cult of the individual and

the other opposes it, as Khrushchev's group try to describe it. In reality, what we have here to do with is an important matter of principle: to stand or not for the leninist principle on relations between the masses, the class, the party and the leadership essential for every party that aspires to be a true combative staff of the proletariat and of its revolutionary movement; to stand or not for the revolutionary leaders like J. V. Stalin, and protect them from attacks and slanders by foes and renegates like Khrushchev and Tito; to oppose or not interference in internal affairs of fraternal parties; to oppose or not attempts to dictate and force on others the leaders they should pick and the leaders they should liquidate, or to fling the door open to chaos, disorganization and enfeeblement of the party and of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a thing which jeopardizes the whole cause of the working class and of socialism; to legalize or not counter-revolutionary putsches by usurpers and careerists, by traitors and foes of communism, whom N. Khrushchev in his own example tries to bring to power?

The attack against Stalin is N. Khrushchev's first treacherous step directed against marxism-leninism, against the international communist and workers movement, against the glorious Soviet Union itself, against its achievements and its prestige. And the first step is accompanied by many others, as a result of which Khrushchevian revisionism turned into a whole system sanctioned in the new program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, became the great-

est menace which the history of the international communist movement has ever met with so far, became the most savage and dangerous enemy of the cause of socialism and communism, that has undermined the unity of the socialist camp and of the world revolutionary and liberation movement, that has caused and is causing immeasurable harm to the cause of socialism, of national independence, of democracy and of peace in the world. Therefore, to expose N. Khrushchev and his revisionist group, to firmly uphold J. V Stalin and his work, means to defend marxism-leninism, to defend the socialist camp and the international communist movement, to defend the Soviet Union and the historic achievements of the Soviet people, to defend the revolution, to defend the cause of socialism and of communism. This is today a duty of primary importance of all revolutionaries, of all true marxist-leninists.

Just as the leaders of the 2nd International, Bernstein and Kautzky, began their betrayal by repudiating Marx and Engels, just as the Trotzkyites, Bukharinists, and Zinovievists began their betrayal by rejecting Lenin, so N. Khrushchev's group and their followers have begun their betrayal by disowning Stalin. History repeats itself but the present revisionists should not forget that not only acts but their consequences repeat themselves also. The same destiny awaits them as that of their predecessors. Sooner or later their defeat is inevitable: marxism-leninism will come off triumphant over all foes and traitors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

— N. Khrushchev's fight against «the cult of the individual» is a means to conceal and justify his anti-marxist and traitorous line of action 5

— The aim of the revisionists is to do away with the dictatorship of the proletariat 16

— The revisionists try to degenerate and to liquidate the revolutionary party of the working class 31

— Under pretext of «fighting the cult of the individual the revisionists have flung the door open to the penetration of bourgeois ideology 40

— The anti-Stalinist course of the Khrushchevian revisionists is the course of capitalist degeneration of socialist economy 52

— The anti-Stalinist line in the field of foreign policy is that of capitulation to and unity with the capitalists 74

N. Khrushchev's group have replaced proletarian internationalism with nationalism and chauvinism 99

— The problem of the stand towards Stalin — great problem of principle for the whole international communist movement 117